

## PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS RESPONSE TO JANUARY 3, 2023 ORDER (DOC 4801)

Subdivision	Case No.	Plaintiffs' Firm Name	PFS Available in Repository on or before 10/14/22? Y or N	If PFS placed in Repository after 10/14/22, please note date placed in repository	Defendant	Has this Defendant Alleged a Service Defect in Recent Filings? Y or N	If YES, has service been perfected?	Date Service Perfected	Further Explanation Regarding Service Issue
Upshur County, TX v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	1:17-op- 45085-DAP	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
City of Lorain (OH)	1:17-op-45000	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Lorain, Ohio	1:17-op-45000	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Parma, Ohio	1:17-op-45001	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Parma, Ohio	1:17-op-45001	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Richland County Children's Services (OH)	1:17-op-45003	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	defendant to be dismissed
Richland County Children's Services, Ohio	1:17-op-45003	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	defendant to be dismissed
City of Toledo (OH)	1:17-op-45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Toledo, Ohio	1:17-op-45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Birmingham, Alabama	1:17-op-45008	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Birmingham, Alabama	1:17-op-45008	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Fiscal Court of Spencer County (KY)	1:17-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	See Explanation.	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	Spencer County, KY, terminated the National Consortium's Representation via email on 07/08/2021 because it mistakenly hired 2 different groups of attorneys to represent it in the opioid litigation who unwittingly filed separate complaints with disparate defendants. The National Consortium served a PFS on December 18, 2018. However, the National Consortium did not upload the PFS to the repository. The parallel case number is Case No. 1:19-op-46029-DAP and it appears that a PFS in that case was timely uploaded to the repository.
Fiscal Court of Spencer County, Kentucky	1:17-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	See Explanation.	Amneal	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	Spencer County, KY, terminated the National Consortium's Representation via email on 07/08/2021 because it mistakenly hired 2 different groups of attorneys to represent it in the opioid litigation who unwittingly filed separate complaints with disparate defendants. The National Consortium served a PFS on December 18, 2018. However, the National Consortium did not upload the PFS to the repository. The parallel case number is Case No. 1:19-op-46029-DAP and it appears that a PFS in that case was timely uploaded to the repository.
Bell County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45026	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Knox County Fiscal Court (KS)	1:17-op-45028	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	Def. Notice lists case as Knox, KS, when the case number is for Knox County, KY.
Leslie County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45029	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Leslie County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45029	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Whitley County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45030	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Whitley County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45030	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Clay County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45031	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Clay County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45031	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		UCB	Yes		12/18/2020	
City of Dayton, Ohio	1:17-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Dayton, Ohio	1:17-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Tacoma, Washington	1:17-op-45047	Keller Rohrbach L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
People of State of Illinois, et al.	1:17-op-45049	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	8/26/2019	
People of State of Illinois, et al.	1:17-op-45049	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	8/26/2019	
Wyoming County Commission (WV)	1:17-op-45051	McGraw Law Office	No		JM Smith	No			PFS will be forthcoming

Kanawha County, WV	1:17-op-45063	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	
Columbia County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:17-op-45068	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
Mower County, Minnesota	1:17-op-45072	Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/25/2019	
County of McLennan, Texas	1:17-op-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of McLennan, Texas	1:17-op-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of McLennan, TX	1:17-op-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of McLennan, TX	1:17-op-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Fort Payne, AL	1:17-op-45079	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	1/4/2021	
Fort Payne, AL	1:17-op-45079	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	No	N/A	Plaintiff did not sue defendant.
City of Lafayette, IN	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, Indiana	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, Indiana	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Lafayette, IN	1:17-op-45081	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Hammond, Indiana	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Hammond, Indiana	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Hamond, Indiana	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Hammond, IN	1:17-op-45082	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Louis County, Missouri	1:17-op-45083	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	N	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
St. Louis County, Missouri	1:17-op-45083	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	N	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
Boyd County Fiscal Court (KY)_	1:17-op-45084	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
County of Upshur (TX)	1:17-op-45085	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Morris (TX)	1:17-op-45086	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/20/19
City of Indianapolis, IN, et al.	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, Indiana, et al.	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, Indiana, et al.	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, Indiana; Marion County, Indiana	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
City of Indianapolis, IN and Marion County, IN	1:17-op-45091	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented on 12/18/2018
Adams County, WI	1:17-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Adams County, WI	1:17-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Adams County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Adams County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
Scott County Board of Commissioners, Indiana	1:17-op-45094	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 04/08/20 and again on 10/13/22. Out of abundance of caution a further PFS was placed in repository on 02/14/23. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received 02/22/23.
Scott County, Indiana Board of Commissioners, Indiana	1:17-op-45094	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 04/08/20 and again on 10/13/22. Out of abundance of caution a further PFS was placed in repository on 02/14/23. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/27/23, received 03/01/2023

Marathon County, WI	1:17-op-45095	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Marathon County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45095	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Green County, WI	1:17-op-45096	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Green County, WI	1:17-op-45096	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Green County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45096	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Tallapoosa County (AL)	1:17-op-45097	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/24/2019	
Tallapoosa County, AL	1:17-op-45097	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
Sauk County, WI	1:17-op-45098	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Iowa County, WI	1:17-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Iowa County, WI	1:17-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Iowa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Iowa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Luzerne County, Pennsylvania v.	1:17-op-45100	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
Gadsden, AL	1:17-op-45101	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	1/4/2021	
Door County, WI	1:17-op-45104	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Door County, WI	1:17-op-45104	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Door County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45104	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Fond du Lac County, WI	1:17-op-45106	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45106	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Douglas County, WI	1:17-op-45107	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Douglas County, WI	1:17-op-45107	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Douglas County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45107	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Rock County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45108	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
Rock County, WI	1:17-op-45108	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Rock County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45108	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Pulaski County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:17-op-45109	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
County of Perry (KY)	1:17-op-45110	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/10/2020	
Eau Claire County, WI	1:17-op-45112	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Eau Claire County, WI	1:17-op-45112	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			

Eau Claire County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45112	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Washington County, WI	1:17-op-45114	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Washington County, WI	1:17-op-45114	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Washington County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45114	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Grant County, WI	1:17-op-45115	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Grant County, WI	1:17-op-45115	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Grant County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45115	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Rusk County, WI	1:17-op-45116	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Columbia County, WI	1:17-op-45118	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Columbia County, WI	1:17-op-45118	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Columbia County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45118	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Shawano County, WI	1:17-op-45119	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Oconto County, WI	1:17-op-45120	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Oconto County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45120	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jackson County, WI	1:17-op-45121	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Jackson County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45121	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jefferson County, WI	1:17-op-45122	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Jefferson County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45122	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Washburn County, WI	1:17-op-45123	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Washburn County, WI	1:17-op-45123	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Washburn County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45123	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Langlade County WI	1:17-op-45124	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Langlade County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45124	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Florence County, WI	1:17-op-45125	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Florence County, WI	1:17-op-45125	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Florence County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45125	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Price County, WI	1:17-op-45126	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			



Price County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45126	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Wood County, WI	1:17-op-45127	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Wood County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45127	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Sheboygan County, WI	1:17-op-45128	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Oneida County, WI	1:17-op-45129	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Oneida County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45129	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Ashland County, WI	1:17-op-45130	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Ashland County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45130	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Burnett County, WI	1:17-op-45131	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Burnett County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45131	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Chippewa County, WI	1:17-op-45132	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Chippewa County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45132	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Dunn County, WI	1:17-op-45133	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Dunn County, WI	1:17-op-45133	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Dunn County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45133	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Forest County, WI	1:17-op-45134	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Forest County, WI	1:17-op-45134	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Forest County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45134	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Manitowoc County, WI	1:17-op-45135	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Manitowoc County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45135	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Marquette County, WI	1:17-op-45136	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Marquette County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45136	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Sawyer County, WI	1:17-op-45137	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Trempealeau County, WI	1:17-op-45138	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Waushara County, WI	1:17-op-45139	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Waushara County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45139	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Buffalo County, WI	1:17-op-45141	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			

Buffalo County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45141	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Calumet County, WI	1:17-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Calumet County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Dodge County, WI	1:17-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Dodge County, WI	1:17-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Dodge County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Kenosha County, WI	1:17-op-45144	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Kenosha County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45144	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Marinette County, WI	1:17-op-45145	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Marinette County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45145	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Monroe County, WI	1:17-op-45146	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Monroe County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45146	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Monroe County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45146	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
St. Croix County, WI	1:17-op-45147	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
St. Croix County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45147	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Vernon County, WI	1:17-op-45148	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Vernon County, WI	1:17-op-45148	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Vernon County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45148	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Clark County, WI	1:17-op-45150	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Clark County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45150	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
(1) People of State of Illinois; (2) People of Gallatin County, IL; and (3) Gallatin County, IL	1:17-op-45152	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Buncombe County (NC)	1:17-op-45153	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/18/2019	
Township of Irvington, NJ	1:17-op-45156	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Demand For Waiver Sent 2/15/2023; Counsel for Indivior acknowledged receipt of demand on 2/22/2023. Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
County of Titus (TX)	1:17-op-45161	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/20/19.
City of Manchester, New Hampshire	1:17-op-45163	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Manchester, New Hampshire	1:17-op-45163	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	

Anderson (Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish), LA	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Anderson, Douglas (Avoyelles Parish Sheriff, Louisiana)	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Douglas Anderson, Avoyelles Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	6/7/2019	
Douglas Anderson, Duly Elected Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Office and the Avoyelles Parish Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Douglas Anderson, Duly Elected Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Avoyelles Parish Sheriff's Office and the Avoyelles Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Douglas Anderson, Sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana	1:17-op-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Pierce County, WI	1:17-op-45165	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Pierce County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45165	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Waupaca County, WI	1:17-op-45166	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Waupaca County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45166	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Waupaca County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45166	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
Lincoln County, WI	1:17-op-45167	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Lincoln County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45167	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Bayfield County, WI	1:17-op-45168	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Bayfield County, Wisconsin	1:17-op-45168	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jefferson County Commission	1:17-OP-45170	Skinner Law Firm			TopRx	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Jefferson County Commission (WV)	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			JM Smith	No			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Jefferson County Commission, West Virginia	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Jefferson County Commission, WV	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			American Sales Company, LLC	Yes			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Jefferson County Commission, WV	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Jefferson County Commission, WV	1:17-op-45170	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Berkeley County Council, West Virginia	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			American Sales Company, LLC	Yes			Dismissed on 02/28/2023

Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Berkeley County Council, WV	1:17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed on 02/28/2023
Hilton (Sheriff of Rapides Parish), LA	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Hilton, William (Rapides Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
William Hilton, Duly Elected Sheriff of Rapides Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office and the Rapides Parish Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
William Hilton, Duly Elected Sheriff of Rapides Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Rapides Parish Sheriff's Office and the Rapides Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
William Hilton, Rapides Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
William Hilton, Sheriff of Rapides Parish, Louisiana	1:17-op-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Mancuso (Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish), LA	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Mancuso, Tony (Calcasieu Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Tony Mancuso, Calcasieu Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Tony Mancuso, Duly Elected Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Calcasieu Parish Sheriff's Office and the Calcasieu Parish Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Tony Mancuso, Duly Elected Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Calcasieu Parish Sheriff's Office and the Calcasieu Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Tony Mancuso, Sheriff of Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana	1:17-op-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Garber (Sheriff of Lafayette Parish), LA	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Garber, Mark (Lafayette Parish Sheriff, Louisiana)	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			

Mark T. Garber, Duly Elected Sheriff of Lafayette Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Office and the Lafayette Parish Law Enforcement District	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Mark T. Garber, Duly Elected Sheriff of Lafayette Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Office and the Lafayette Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Mark T. Garber, Lafayette Parish Sheriff	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
Mark T. Garber, Sheriff of Lafayette Parish, Louisiana	1:17-op-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Polk County, IA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op- 45116-DAP	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
Adair Co., IA et al v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op- 45122-DAP	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	
Black Hawk County et al v. Purdue Pharma LP et al.	1:18-op- 45303-DAP	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
Lafayette County, MO AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al	1:18-op- 45840-DAP	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	7/15/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 2/21/2023.
Cass County, MO v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp. et al	1:18-op- 45841-DAP	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	7/15/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 2/21/2023.
Allamakee County v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op- 45983-DAP	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
County of Hardin (IL)	1:18-op-45003	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals		Yes	3/30/2021	
City of Tuscumbia (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
County of Colbert (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

County of Franklin (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee (AL)	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, Alabama et al	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, Alabama; City of Tuscumbia, Alabama; County of Franklin, Alabama; County of Colbert, Alabama	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Cherokee, AL City of Tuscumbia, AL, Counties of Colbert and Franklin, AL	1:18-op-45005	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.



New Hanover County (NC)	1:18-op-45006	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
City of Opp, AL	1:18-op-45011	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Yadkin County, NC	1:18-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
City of New Castle, IN	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, Indiana	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, Indiana	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, Indiana	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of New Castle, IN	1:18-op-45016	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Sunflower County (MS)	1:18-op-45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
Sunflower County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Sunflower County, MS	1:18-op-45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
Humphreys County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45021	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Humphreys County, MS	1:18-op-45021	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
Washington County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Washington County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Washington County, MS	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Washington County, MS	1:18-op-45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	
Smith County (TN)	1:18-op-45029	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes		Waiver of service filed on docket 3/20/2023.
Smith County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45029	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Montgomery, Texas	1:18-op-45030	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Montgomery, Texas	1:18-op-45030	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Montgomery, TX	1:18-op-45030	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Montgomery, TX	1:18-op-45030	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
County of Lake, Ohio	1:18-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Lake, Ohio	1:18-op-45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Claiborne County (MS)	1:18-op-45035	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
Claiborne County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45035	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			
Butler County Board of Commissioners, OH	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Target Corporation	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Target Corporation's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Target Corporation's counsel responded that they needed to confirm with their client whether they could accept service. On 3/2/2023, we emailed waiver of service forms with the Short Form Complaint and Original Complaint. Target Corporation's counsel emailed on 3/3/2023 with a refusal to accept service.
Butler County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Mylan's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Mylan's counsel emailed on 3/2/2023 acknowledging receipt of our messages and indicating that they "intend to respond within the timeframe set forth in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in advance of the March 29 extended deadline for submission of your response to our status report." On 3/20/2023, counsel for Mylan confirmed that it would not be waiving service.

Butler County Board of Commissioners, OH	1:18-op-45037	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Indivior	Yes	No	N/A	We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Indivior's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Indivior's counsel emailed on 3/16/2023 with a refusal to accept service.
County of Ashtabula, OH	1:18-op-45050	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
County of Ashtabula, Ohio	1:18-op-45050	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	1:18-op-45052	LLBO Legal Dept.		N/A	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	
Township Of Bloomfield, NJ	1:18-op-45053	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	2/15/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Demand For Waiver Sent 2/15/2023; Counsel for Indivior acknowleged receipt of demand on 2/22/2023. Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Lansing, MI	1:18-op-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Lansing, Michigan	1:18-op-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Grand Traverse, MI	1:18-op-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L's clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L's clients' service upon Masters is presumed valid. What's more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L's clients' service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L's clients' service is deemed invalid, Masters' delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L's alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, "for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]" Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L's clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L's clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court's Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters' waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters' delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L's clients, and Masters' dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters' intent to prejudice plaintiffs.

County of Grand Traverse, Michigan	1:18-op-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Mylan's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Mylan's counsel emailed on 3/2/2023 acknowledging receipt of our messages and indicating that they "intend to respond within the timeframe set forth in Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in advance of the March 29 extended deadline for submission of your response to our status report." We have not heard back yet. On 3/20/2023, counsel for Mylan confirmed that it would not be waiving service.
Clinton County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45060	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	
									We mistakenly believed that service was unnecessary at the time of filing the Short Form Complaint. We emailed Indivior's counsel on 2/21/2023 after realizing that service was necessary to ask if they would accept service. Having not heard back, we followed up on 2/24/2023. Again, with no response, we emailed the approved waiver of service forms to counsel on 3/2/2023 with the Short Form Complaint, Original Complaint, and waiver of service forms. Indivior's counsel emailed on 3/16/2023 with a refusal to accept service.
Clinton County Board of Commissioners, OH	1:18-op-45060	Gibbs Law Group LLP	Yes	N/A	Indivior	Yes	No	N/A	
County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
Nolan County, TX	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
									On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			
									On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of Nolan, Texas	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			
Nolan County, TX	1:18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Nashua, New Hampshire	1:18-op-45062	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Wichita, Texas	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Wichita, Texas	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Wichita, TX	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Wichita, TX	1:18-op-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Chippewa, MI	1:18-op-45066	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Chippewa, Michigan	1:18-op-45066	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Delta, MI	1:18-op-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Delta, Michigan	1:18-op-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Escanaba, MI	1:18-op-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Escanaba, Michigan	1:18-op-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Marion County (MS)	1:18-op-45075	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
Marion County, MS	1:18-op-45075	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
Mobile, AL	1:18-op-45076	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
Polk County, TX	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs’ Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio’s Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of Polk, Texas	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/26/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs’ Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio’s Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
Polk County, TX	1:18-op-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
County of Lorain (OH)	1:18-op-45078	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Lorain, Ohio	1:18-op-45078	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Trumbull v. Purdue Pharma L.P.	1:18-op-45079	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
County of Trumbull, Ohio	1:18-op-45079	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Saginaw, MI	1:18-op-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Saginaw, Michigan	1:18-op-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Genesee, MI	1:18-op-45083	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Genesee, Michigan	1:18-op-45083	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			



									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Detroit, MI	1:18-op-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Detroit, Michigan	1:18-op-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Macomb, MI	1:18-op-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Macomb, Michigan	1:18-op-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Surry County (NC)	1:18-op-45086	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County (TN)	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes		Waiver of service filed on docket 3/20/2023.
Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Metropolitan Government of Nashville, Tennessee et al.	1:18-op-45088	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Hikma	No			

Randy Seal, Duly Elected Sheriff of Washington Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Washington Parish Sheriff's Office and the Washington Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Randy Seal, Duly Elected Sheriff of Washington Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Washington Parish Sheriff's Office and the Washington Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Randy Seal, Sheriff of Washington Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Randy Seal, Washington Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
Seal (Sheriff of Washington Parish), LA	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Seal, Randy (Washington Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Rosebud Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45095				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Amite County (MS)	1:18-op-45097	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Ivy Woods, Duly Elected Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff's Office and the Jefferson Davis Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Ivy Woods, Duly Elected Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish, in his Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff's Office and the Jefferson Davis Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Ivy Woods, Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Woods (Sheriff of Jefferson Davis Parish), LA	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Woods, Ivy (Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			

Cecil County, Maryland v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corp., et al.	1:18-op-45100	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
County of Anoka, MN	1:18-op-45101	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes			Not Named in Complaint
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Roscommon, MI	1:18-op-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Roscommon, Michigan	1:18-op-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Woburn (MA)	1:18-op-45103	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Marquette, MI	1:18-op-45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Marquette, Michigan	1:18-op-45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Crawford, MI	1:18-op-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Crawford, Michigan	1:18-op-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Methuen (MA)	1:18-op-45106	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
Haywood County, TN	1:18-op-45107	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Leelanau, MI	1:18-op-45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Leelanau, Michigan	1:18-op-45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Mason, MI	1:18-op-45112	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Mason, Michigan	1:18-op-45112	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Manistee, MI	1:18-op-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Manistee, Michigan	1:18-op-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Polk County, IA	1:18-op-45116	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Polk County, IA	1:18-OP-45116 (S.D. Iowa)	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Brown County, WI, et al	1:18-op-45117	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Brown County, Wisconsin, et al.	1:18-op-45117	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing

Union County, MS	1:18-op-45120	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/25/2019	
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, Indiana	1:18-op-45121	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
Adair County, IA, et al.	1:18-op-45122	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Adair County, IA	1:18-OP-45122 (S.D. Iowa)	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Jennings County, Indiana	1:18-op-45131	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Jennings County, Indiana	1:18-op-45131	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Jennings County, Indiana	1:18-op-45131	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Jennings County, IN	1:18-op-45131	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Williamson County (TN)	1:18-op-45134	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	1/20/2021	
Greene County (TN)	1:18-op-45136	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
County of Jones, Texas	1:18-op-45139	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Jones, TX	1:18-op-45139	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Jones, TX	1:18-op-45139	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
Craft (Sheriff of Vernon Parish), LA	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Craft, John (Vernon Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
John Craft, Duly Elected Sheriff of Vernon Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Vernon Parish Sheriff's Office and the Vernon Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
John Craft, Duly Elected Sheriff of Vernon Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Vernon Parish Sheriff's Office and the Vernon Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
John Craft, Sheriff of Vernon Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
John Craft, Vernon Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Douglas Hebert III, Sheriff of Allen Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Douglas Hebert, III, Allen Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Office of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Douglas Hebert, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of Allen Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Allen Parish Sheriff's Office and the Allen Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing



Hebert (Sheriff of Allen Parish), LA	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Herbert, Douglas III (Allen Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Richardson (Sheriff of Sabine Parish), LA	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Richardson, Ronald (Sabine Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Ronald Richardson, Duly Elected Sheriff of Sabine Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Sabine Parish Sheriff's Office and the Sabine Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Ronald Richardson, Duly Elected Sheriff of Sabine Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Sabine Parish Sheriff's Office and the Sabine Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Ronald Richardson, Sabine Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
Ronald Richardson, Sheriff of Sabine Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Catawba County (NC)	1:18-op-45145	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
Forrest County (MS)	1:18-op-45147	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Forrest County, MS	1:18-op-45147	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
City of Alexandria, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
City of Alexandria, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
City of Alexandria, Indiana, et al.	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
City of Alexandria, Indiana; City of Elwood, Indiana; Madison County, Indiana	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
City of Alexandria, IN, City of Elwood, IN, and Madison County, IN	1:18-op-45151	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS's were originally served on 12/17/2018 and supplemented for Alexandria on 12/18/2018
Baldwin County, AL	1:18-op-45152	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
Hancock County (TN)	1:18-op-45153	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/8/2023	
Jay Russell, Duly elected Sheriff of Ouachita Parish in his official capacity as Sheriff & the Ouachita Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Jay Russell, Duly Elected Sheriff of Ouachita Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Ouachita Parish Sheriff's Office and the Ouachita Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jay Russell, Ouachita Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	

Jay Russell, Sheriff of Ouachita Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Russell (Sheriff of Ouachita Parish), LA	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Russell, Jay (Ouachita Sheriff, Louisiana)	1:18-op-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
City of Revere, MA	1:18-op-45155	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of Revere, MA	1:18-op-45155	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, Indiana	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Lake County, IN	1:18-op-45156	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, IN	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, Indiana	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Marshall County, IN	1:18-op-45157	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, Indiana, et al.	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville, Indiana; Fayette County, Indiana	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Connersville and Fayette County, IN	1:18-op-45159	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Baton Rouge, Louisiana	1:18-op-45160	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	
East Baton Rouge, LA	1:18-op-45160	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
Johnson County (TN)	1:18-op-45164	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
Candler County (GA)	1:18-op-45165	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/3/20.
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Candler County, Georgia	1:18-op-45165	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
County of Huerfano, Colorado	1:18-op-45168	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
County of Huerfano, Colorado	1:18-op-45168	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
County of Clay, Texas	1:18-op-45169	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Clay, TX	1:18-op-45169	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Clay, TX	1:18-op-45169	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			

County of Onondaga, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45170	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).</p> <p>Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On April 14, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On June 3, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>•On June 4, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., requesting information and we responded. .</p> <p>•On June 5, 2019, Waivers were returned for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC only.</p> <p>•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-45170</p>
City of Dora (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<p><b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.</p>
City of Jasper (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<p><b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.</p>

City of Sumiton (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
County of Marion, Alabama; County of Pickens, Alabama; County of Walker, Alabama; City of Dora, Alabama; City of Jasper, Alabama; City of Sumiton, Alabama	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marion County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marion County, Alabama et al.	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Pickens County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

									<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Walker County (AL)	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanias, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
Counties of Marion, Pickens, and Walker, AL, and Cities of Dora, Jasper, and Sumiton, AL	1:18-op-45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanias, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Skagit County, Washington	1:18-op-45173	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Municipality of Guayanilla, Puerto Rico	1:18-op-45176	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool, Arizona	1:18-op-45178	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Coffee County, AL	1:18-op-45182	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
Stokes County, NC	1:18-op-45185	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Mobile County, AL	1:18-op-45186	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	

Edrick Soileau, Duly Elected Sheriff of Evangeline Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Evangeline Parish Sheriff's Office and the Evangeline Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Edrick Soileau, Duly Elected Sheriff of Evangeline Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Evangeline Parish Sheriff's Office and the Evangeline Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Edrick Soileau, Evangeline Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
Edrick Soileau, Sheriff of Evangeline Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Soileau (Sheriff of Evangeline Parish), LA	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Soileau, Edrick (Evangeline Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Pierce County, Washington	1:18-op-45195	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Tuscaloosa County, AL	1:18-op-45196	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/18/2020	
Municipality of Sabana Grande, Puerto Rico, et al.	1:18-op-45197	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Municipality of Sabana Grande, Puerto Rico; Municipality of Cayey, Puerto Rico	1:18-op-45197	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Municipality of Sabana Grande and Municipality of Cayey, PR	1:18-op-45197	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Selma, AL	1:18-op-45198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of Union Springs, AL	1:18-op-45204	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
Lamar County, Alabama; City of Vernon, Alabama; and Hal Allred, Sheriff of Lamar County, Alabama	1:18-op-45210	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.



Fayette County, Alabama; City of Fayette, Alabama; Byron Yerby, Alabama	1:18-op-45211	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Montgomery County, Maryland	1:18-op-45212	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 47. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. by way of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Montgomery County, MD	1:18-op-45212	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V.	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 40, 44. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiff also served Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. has been on notice since April 25, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Enterprise, AL	1:18-op-45213	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
City of Ozark, AL	1:18-op-45214	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Crockett County (TN)	1:18-op-45215	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
Town of Butler, AL	1:18-op-45216	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Marion, AL	1:18-op-45217	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County (GA)	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/19/19.
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
The Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, Georgia	1:18-op-45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Oconee County (GA)	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Oconee County, Georgia	1:18-op-45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	1:18-op-45220				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Mecklenburg County (NC)	1:18-op-45221	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
Mecklenburg County, NC	1:18-op-45221	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
Haskell County, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
Haskell County, TX	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of Haskell, Texas	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
Haskell County, TX	1:18-op-45223	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Charleston, WV	1:18-op-45224	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Charleston, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at 12:58 PM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Town of Fort Gay, WV	1:18-OP-45225	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	7/17/2018	Curative waiver sent to Defense counsel; Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons - <i>instead of a Waiver of the Service of Summons</i> - for the Town of Fort Gay, WV was signed and returned by counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 7/17/2018 with the originally served Notice signed by Linda Singer on behalf of the Town of Fort Gay, WV and corresponding complaint.
Summers County Commission	1:18-OP-45226	Wooton, Davis, Hussell &	No	N/A	TopRx	Yes	No	N/A	Summers County has participated in a global settlement with regard to the State of West Virginia and pursuant to MOA
Cullman County, AL	1:18-op-45227	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
Childress County, Texas	1:18-op-45229	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Childress, Texas	1:18-op-45229	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Childress, TX	1:18-op-45229	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Marshall County, Alabama et al.	1:18-op-45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanis, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

Marshall County, Alabama; City of Albertville, Alabama; City of Arab, Alabama; City of Boaz, Alabama; City of Guntersville, Alabama; Town of Douglas, Alabama; Town of Grant; Alabama	1:18-op-45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marshall County, AL, Cities of Albertville, Arab, Boaz and Guntersville, AL, and Towns of Douglas and Grant, AL	1:18-op-45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Kings County, Washington	1:18-op-45231	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Hikma	No			
County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Mylan	No			
County of La Salle, TX	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
The County of La Salle, Texas	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			On this May 1, 2019 Plaintiffs served Amneal with a Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons, Waiver of the Service of Summons, Plaintiffs' Short Form Complaint and The County of Summit, Ohio's Third Amended Complaint and Jury Demand. Plaintiffs contest that service was not properly performed.
County of La Salle, TX	1:18-op-45234	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Bloomington, IN, et al.	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington, Indiana; Monroe County, Indiana	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Bloomington and Monroe County, IN	1:18-op-45235	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Jeff Davis County (GA)	1:18-op-45237	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:18-op-45237	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

Crisp County (GA)	1:18-op-45238	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Crisp County, Georgia	1:18-op-45238	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Lakewood, Ohio	1:18-op-45240	Lowe Scott Fisher Co., LPA	No	N/A	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	Pursuant to the Court's Order (Docket No. 638 dtd. June 19, 2018), Plaintiff City of Lakewood served its PFS on liaison counsel on Dec. 13, 2018. Unknown to Plaintiff City of Lakewood, Plaintiff's liaison counsel apparently failed to file its PFS with the PFS Repository.
Pickett County (TN)	1:18-op-45242	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
Pickett County, TN	1:18-op-45242	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	4/7/2021	
Rutherford County (NC)	1:18-op-45243	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Bullock County, AL	1:18-op-45246	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
Clay County, AL	1:18-op-45248	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	1/13/2020	Plaintiff's counsel was initially unable to locate the required Request for Wavier of Service the Defendant. Defendant amended its Request for Waiver form on 8/19/2019 [Doc. 2491]. On 08/20/2019, Plaintiff emailed request to Defendant's counsel. Plaintiff's counsel sent follow-up email and Defendant sent signed Waiver of Service on 01/13/2020. Waiver of Service filed 01/14/2020 [Doc. 36].
Indiana County, Pennsylvania v.	1:18-op-45249	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
Sumter County (GA)	1:18-op-45250	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Sumter County, Georgia	1:18-op-45250	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Sandusky, Ohio	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Sandusky County Board of Commissioners (OH)	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Sandusky County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Sandusky County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45254	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Rutherford County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45258	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Hikma	No			
Rutherford County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45258	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Williams (Sheriff of East Carroll Parish), LA	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Williams, Wydette (East Carroll Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Wydette Williams, Duly Elected Sheriff of East Carroll Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the East Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office and the East Carroll Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing

Wydette Williams, Duly Elected Sheriff of East Carroll Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the East Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office and the East Carroll Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Wydette Williams, East Carroll Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/22/2019	
Wydette Williams, Sheriff of East Carroll Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Jerry L. Philley, Duly Elected Sheriff of West Carroll Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the West Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office and the West Carroll Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jerry L. Philley, Duly Elected Sheriff of West Carroll Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the West Carroll Parish Sheriff's Office and the West Carroll Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Jerry L. Philley, Sheriff of West Carroll Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Jerry Philley, West Carroll Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	12/4/2019	
Philey, Jerry (West Carroll Parish Sheriff, Louisiana)	1:18-op-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Oglethorpe County (GA)	1:18-op-45262	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Oglethorpe County, Georgia	1:18-op-45262	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Caldwell County (NC)	1:18-op-45263	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
City of Saint Albans, WV	1:18-op-45269	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Saint Albans, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at 1:58 PM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Scott County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45273	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Scott County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45273	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Amneal	No			
Randolph County (NC)	1:18-op-45275	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Barron County, WI et al	1:18-op-45277	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Barron County, Wisconsin	1:18-op-45277	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Clarke County (MS)	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.

Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Hikma	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Amneal	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Mylan	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, MS	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Clarke County, MS	1:18-op-45278	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Indivior	No			Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Philadelphia (MS)	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Philadelphia, Mississippi	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Mylan	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Philadelphia, MS	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Philadelphia, MS	1:18-op-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Indivior	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
LaPorte County, IN	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, Indiana	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, Indiana	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, Indiana	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
LaPorte County, IN	1:18-op-45280	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Rome, Georgia, et al.	1:18-op-45282	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Irwin County (GA)	1:18-op-45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	No			
Irwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Irwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Irwin County, Georgia	1:18-op-45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Cook County (GA)	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Cook County, Georgia	1:18-op-45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Hall County (GA)	1:18-op-45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Hall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Hall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			



Hall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Crawford County, OH	1:18-op-45288	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	No	3/23/2023	
Madison County (GA)	1:18-op-45296	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Madison County, Georgia	1:18-op-45296	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Madison County, Georgia	1:18-op-45296	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Madison County, Georgia	1:18-op-45296	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Walton County (GA)	1:18-op-45297	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Walton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45297	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Walton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45297	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Walton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45297	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Hawkins County (TN)	1:18-op-45299	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
City of W. Lafayette, Indiana	1:18-op-45300	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, IN	1:18-op-45300	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, Indiana	1:18-op-45300	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, Indiana	1:18-op-45300	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of West Lafayette, IN	1:18-op-45300	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
County of Camp (TX)	1:18-op-45301	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 3/19/2019.
Black Hawk County, IA et al	1:18-op-45303	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Black Hawk County, IA	1:18-OP-45303 (S.D. Iowa)	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Cleveland County (NC)	1:18-op-45304	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
Cleveland County, NC	1:18-op-45304	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
City of Logan, WV	1:18-op-45317	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Logan, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at 10:47 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
City of Smithers, WV	1:18-op-45319	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Smithers, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/12/2018 at 9:42 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Town of Rupert, WV	1:18-op-45323	Motley Rice	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/3/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for the Town of Rupert, WV was signed and returned by counsel David R. Beasley on behalf of Associated Pharmacies, Inc. on 7/3/2019 and filed 10/20/2020 as ECF 22 on the case docket.
Town of Quinwood, WV	1:18-op-45324	Motley Rice	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel, who stated willingness to accept service on client's behalf. However, "in light of the Court's January 3, 2023 Order and the filings related to that Order, we are not currently in a position to execute the waiver of service you sent." Consequently, perfection of service is in process but pending changed Defense position.

Gautreaux, Sid III (East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff , Louisiana)	1:18-op-45325	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Sid Gautreaux III, Sheriff of East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45325	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Sid J. Gautreaux, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of East Baton Rouge Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office and the East Baton Rouge Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45325	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Sid J. Gautreaux, III, Duly Elected Sheriff of East Baton Rouge Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office and the East Baton Rouge Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45325	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
City of Broadview Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45330	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Broadview Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45330	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Pensacola (FL)	1:18-op-45331	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of Pensacola (FL)	1:18-op-45331	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Decatur County (GA)	1:18-op-45334	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Decatur County, Georgia	1:18-op-45334	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Decatur County, Georgia	1:18-op-45334	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Decatur County, Georgia	1:18-op-45334	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Pittsfield (MA)	1:18-op-45335	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of Easthampton (MA)	1:18-op-45336	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
City of Northampton (MA)	1:18-op-45337	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	

									<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).</p> <p>Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On April 14, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On June 3, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-45338 Doc Nos. 129 and 130).</p> <p>•On February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal</p>
County of Oneida, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45338	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
									<p>In 2019, each of W&amp;L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&amp;L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&amp;L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&amp;L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&amp;L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&amp;L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&amp;L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz &amp; Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&amp;L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&amp;L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.</p>
County of Gratiot, MI	1:18-op-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Gratiot County, Michigan	1:18-op-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Alcona County, Michigan	1:18-op-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Alcona, MI	1:18-op-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Arenac County, Michigan	1:18-op-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Arenac, MI	1:18-op-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Dickinson, MI	1:18-op-45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Dickinson, Michigan	1:18-op-45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Iosco, MI	1:18-op-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Iosco County, Michigan	1:18-op-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Iron Mountain, MI	1:18-op-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Iron Mountain County, Michigan	1:18-op-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Otsego, MI	1:18-op-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Otsego County, Michigan	1:18-op-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			



									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Montmorency, MI	1:18-op-45347	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Montmorency County, Michigan	1:18-op-45347	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ogemaw, MI	1:18-op-45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Ogemaw County, Michigan	1:18-op-45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Isabella, MI	1:18-op-45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Isabella County, Michigan	1:18-op-45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Shiawassee, MI	1:18-op-45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Shiawassee County, Michigan	1:18-op-45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Lenawee, MI	1:18-op-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Lenawee County, Michigan	1:18-op-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Sanilac, MI	1:18-op-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Sanilac County, Michigan	1:18-op-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Antrim County, Michigan	1:18-op-45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Antrim, MI	1:18-op-45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Hillsdale, MI	1:18-op-45355	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Hillsdale County, Michigan	1:18-op-45355	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
Benzie County, MI	1:18-op-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Benzie County, Michigan	1:18-op-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Osceola, MI	1:18-op-45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Osceola County, Michigan	1:18-op-45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Oceana, MI	1:18-op-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Oceana County, Michigan	1:18-op-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Alger County, Michigan	1:18-op-45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Alger, MI	1:18-op-45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Baraga County, Michigan	1:18-op-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			



									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Baraga, MI	1:18-op-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Luce, MI	1:18-op-45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
Luce County, Michigan	1:18-op-45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Calhoun County (FL)	1:18-op-45363	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Wexford, MI	1:18-op-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Wexford, Michigan	1:18-op-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Jefferson County, Ohio	1:18-op-45365	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Lake, MI	1:18-op-45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
Lake County, Michigan	1:18-op-45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin	1:18-op-45367				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Floyd, Kentucky	1:18-op-45369	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The County of Knott, Kentucky	1:18-op-45370	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/9/2023	
The County of Knott, Kentucky	1:18-op-45370	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/9/2023	
County of Knot, Kentucky	1:18-op-45370	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	

City of Panama City (FL)	1:18-op-45373	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Panama City, FL	1:18-op-45373	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
County of Fulton, Georgia	1:18-op-45374	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
County of Fulton, Georgia	1:18-op-45374	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Multnomah County, OR	1:18-op-45377-DAP	Wiggins Childs Pantazis Fi	No	3/27/2023	Michael Babich	Yes	No		
Banks County (GA)	1:18-op-45378	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/21/19.
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Banks County, Georgia	1:18-op-45378	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Twiggs County (GA)	1:18-op-45379	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Twiggs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45379	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Elbert County (GA)	1:18-op-45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Elbert County, Georgia	1:18-op-45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-op-45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-op-45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Bainbridge (GA)	1:18-op-45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/1/20.
The City of Bainbridge, Georgia	1:18-op-45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Martin County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45388	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Wayne County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45389	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Wayne Cty. Fiscal Court, CA	1:18-op-45389	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	No	00/00/00	Summons issued and awaiting affidavit from process server. Also, Case # listed is for Wayne County, KY and mistakenly named as Wayne County, CA.
(1) Family Practice Clinic of Booneville, Inc. and (2) Family Health Care Clinic, PSC	1:18-op-45390	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/10/2019	
Carter County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-45392	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/7/2021	
Bulloch County (GA)	1:18-op-45394	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/12/20.
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Bulloch County, Georgia	1:18-op-45394	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Itawamba County, Mississippi	1:18-op-45396	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal	No			
Allen County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45401	Spangenberg Shibley & Liber	No	1/28/2023	Mylan	No			As owner of the repository, we were the first to submit our clients PFSs. Due to a technical glitch, this PFS was not transferred into the new repository.
Madison County (TN)	1:18-op-45403	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:18-op-45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
The Unified Government of Macon Bibb County (GA)	1:18-op-45407	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The Unified Government of Macon-Bibb County, Georgia	1:18-op-45407	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
The Unified Government of Macon-Bibb County, Georgia	1:18-op-45407	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Unified Government of Macon-Bibb County, Georgia	1:18-op-45407	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Thurston County, Washington	1:18-op-45409	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Clark County, WA	1:18-op-45410	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Clark County, Washington	1:18-op-45410	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Fentress County (TN)	1:18-op-45419	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/22/2021	
Fentress County, TN	1:18-op-45419	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	4/7/2021	
Jones County (GA)	1:18-op-45424	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Jones County, Georgia	1:18-op-45424	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jones County, Georgia	1:18-op-45424	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Jones County, Georgia	1:18-op-45424	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Warren County (GA)	1:18-op-45425	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Warren County, Georgia	1:18-op-45425	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Warren County, Georgia	1:18-op-45425	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Warren County, Georgia	1:18-op-45425	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

City of North Royalton, Ohio	1:18-op-45427	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of North Royalton, OH	1:18-op-45427	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Douglas County, Minnesota	1:18-op-45428	Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/25/2019	
City of Huron, Ohio	1:18-op-45431	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Huron, OH	1:18-op-45431	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Warren v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45434	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Warren, Ohio	1:18-op-45434	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Northern Arapaho Tribe	1:18-op-45438				Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Northern Arapaho Tribe, WY v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45438				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Counties of Clackamas, Lane, Washington, Clatsop, Columbia, Jackson, Josephine, and Yamhill, OR	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 & 2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place in repository in 11/22	Indivior	No			
County of Clackamas et al., Oregon	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 & 2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place in repository in 11/22	Hikma	No			
County of Clackamas, OR	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	KVK-Tech	No			
County of Clackamas, Oregon	1:18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Mylan	No			
Pocahontas County Commission, West Virginia	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Pocahontas County Commission, WV	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Firm			Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Pocahontas County Commission, WV	1:18-op-45443	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Morgan County Commission	1:18-OP-45444	Skinner Law Firm			TopRx	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
Morgan County Commission, West Virginia	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm			Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
Morgan County Commission, WV	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm			Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
Morgan County Commission, WV	1:18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
City of Macedonia, Ohio	1:18-op-45447	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Macedonia, OH	1:18-op-45447	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of East Cleveland, Ohio	1:18-op-45448	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Newburgh Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45449	kelley & ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Newburgh Heights, OH	1:18-op-45449	kelley & ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Village of Brooklyn Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45450	kelley & ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Village of Brooklyn Heights, OH	1:18-op-45450	kelley & ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		

Cherokee, KS	1:18-op-45452	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
City of Tifton, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Tifton (GA)	1:18-op-45454	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Tifton, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Tifton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45454	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Bay County (FL)	1:18-op-45455	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
Bay County, FL	1:18-op-45455	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/16/2020	
Holmes County (FL)	1:18-op-45456	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Gainesville (GA)	1:18-op-45486	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45486	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Malden (MA)	1:18-op-45487	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
Wyoming County, Pennsylvania	1:18-op-45488	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/21/2020	
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Butts County, Georgia	1:18-op-45490	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Dougherty County (GA)	1:18-op-45491	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Dougherty County, Georgia	1:18-op-45491	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
St. Tammany Parish Coroner's Office and Dr. Charles Preston in his capacity as the Coroner of St. Tammany Parish, LA	1:18-op-45492	Lillis Law Firm & Tonry, Brinson, & Glorioso	No	3/20/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Indivior, through its registered agent in LA, was served with the waiver and notice of lawsuit on May 28, 2019 by certified US Mail. See Green Card attached.
(1) Big Bend Community Based Care Inc.; (2) Lutheran Services Floria Inc.; (3) Central Florida Cares Health System Inc.; (4) Southeast Florida Behavioral Health Network Inc.; and (5) Central Florida Behavioral Health Network Inc.	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No		This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State of Florida
Big Bend Community Based Care, Inc. et al, Florida	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No		This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State of Florida
Big Bend Community Based Case, Inc.	1:18-op-45493	Price Armstrong, LLC	No	N/A	Winn-Dixie	Yes	No		This Plaintiff is not a governmental plaintiff but a private corporation that contracts with the State of Florida
City of Gainesville, Georgia	1:18-op-45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			



City of Milledgeville, Georgia	1:18-op-45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Milledgeville (GA)	1:18-op-45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Milledgeville, Georgia	1:18-op-45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Vanderburgh County, Indiana	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Vanderburgh County (IN)	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018.  Defendant did not allege a service defect. However, upon review, Plaintiff discovered that this Defendant had not been served. We perfected service via process server on 2/28/2023 and and filed proof of service in the individual case.
Vanderburgh County, Indiana	1:18-op-45498	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, IN	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, Indiana	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, Indiana	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, Indiana	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
St. Joseph County, IN	1:18-op-45500	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Prince George's County Maryland	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		American Sales Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	3/21/2023	
Prince George's County, Maryland	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Prince George's County, Maryland	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Prince George's County, MD	1:18-op-45501	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/23/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
DeKalb County (GA)	1:18-op-45503	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
Dekalb County, Georgia	1:18-op-45503	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Jasper County (GA)	1:18-op-45504	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Jasper County, Georgia	1:18-op-45504	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Ben Hill County (GA)	1:18-op-45505	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 11/22/19.
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Ben Hill County, Georgia	1:18-op-45505	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
County of Wilcox, Georgia	1:18-op-45506	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
The County of Wilcox, Georgia	1:18-op-45506	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
County of Wilcox, GA	1:18-op-45506	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Hamilton County (TN)	1:18-op-45507	Mike Moore Law Firm, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	Yes	No		
Lincoln County (GA)	1:18-op-45508	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Lincoln County, Georgia	1:18-op-45508	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	Hikma	No			
Lincoln County, Georgia	1:18-op-45508	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	Amneal	No			
McDuffie County (GA)	1:18-op-45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
McDuffie County, Georgia	1:18-op-45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
McDuffie County, Georgia	1:18-op-45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
McDuffie County, Georgia	1:18-op-45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

City of Phoenix, Arizona	1:18-op-45510	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 33. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court’s recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Keene, New Hampshire	1:18-op-45511	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
The City of Keene, NH	1:18-op-45511	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
City of Hattiesburg (MS)	1:18-op-45512	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Hattiesburg, MS	1:18-op-45512	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
City of Lowell (MA)	1:18-op-45514	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
City of Sandy Springs, Georgia	1:18-op-45516	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
City of Sandy Springs, Georgia	1:18-op-45516	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Sandy Springs, GA	1:18-op-45516	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Clarksville, Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
City of Clarksville, Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
The City of Clarksville, Tennessee	1:18-op-45517	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Clarksville, TN	1:18-op-45517	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Spirit Lake Tribe	1:18-op-45520				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	1:18-op-45521				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
McDowell County (NC)	1:18-op-45524	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
The Fiscal Court of Bourbon County (KY)	1:18-op-45533	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Hancock County (GA)	1:18-op-45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Hancock County, Georgia	1:18-op-45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Metropolis (IL)	1:18-op-45537	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	8/28/2019	
Arizona School Alliance for Workers Compensation	1:18-op-45540	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
The Arizona School Alliance for Workers’ Compensation, Inc.	1:18-op-45540	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla	1:18-op-45541	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Johnson, Johnson, Lucas & Middleton		N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes		N/A	Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45545	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/25/2021	
City of Dunbar, WV	1:18-op-45546	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		As per the template filed 4/25/2018 (ECF 279-1), Plaintiff served counsel Jack Smith on behalf of Masters Pharmaceutical with the City of Dunbar, WV complaint and a waiver form on 7/11/2018 at 10:06 AM. Confirmation of original service and waiver sent with curative waiver to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Harrison County Board of Commissioners, Ohio	1:18-op-45547	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Miami-Dade County, FL	1:18-op-45552	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Baltimore County, Maryland	1:18-op-45554	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 12, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 21. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 12, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have now been effectively cured.
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-45556	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-45556	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		American Sales Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	
Ponca Tribe of Nebraska	1:18-op-45557				Dakota Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Jefferson County, Alabama; Mike Hale, Sheriff of Jefferson County, Alabama; City of Pleasant Grove, Alabama; City of Hueytown, Alabama; City of Mountain Brook, Alabama; Jefferson County Board of Health, Alabama	1:18-op-45558	Riley & Jackson, P.C. Napoli Shkolnik, PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
(1) Jefferson County, AL; (2) Mike Hale as Sheriff of Jeff. Co., AL; (3) City of Pleasantgrove, AL; (4) City of Hueytown, AL; (5) City of Mountain Brook, AL; and (6) Jeff. Co. Bd. of Health	1:18-op-45558	Riley & Jackson, P.C. Napoli Shkolnik, PLLC	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	The case was originally filed in state court. Service on this defendant by the Clerk via certified mail was requested at the office of its registered agent that was on file with the Alabama Secretary of State. We now know this defendant had not discharged its obligation of updating its registered agent information. While service was being attempted on the wrong registered agent at the wrong address, the case was removed from the Circuit Court of Jefferson County to the USDC for the Northern District of Alabama. The case was then quickly transferred into the MDL with a Motion to Remand pending. We did not realize service on Associated Pharmacies after transfer to the MDL had not been perfected and did not request this defendant to execute a waiver of service. This defendant's counsel has agreed to accept service without signing a waiver. Process has been provided to this defendant's counsel.
Habersham County (GA)	1:18-op-45559	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Habersham County, Georgia	1:18-op-45559	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Town of Brewster, MA	1:18-op-4556	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Case number listed incorrectly. It should be 1:18-op-45556.

Town of Billerica, MA	1:18-op-45560	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
Taliaferro County (GA)	1:18-op-45562	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Taliaferro County, Georgia	1:18-op-45562	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Washington County (GA)	1:18-op-45563	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/30/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/7/23.
Washington County, Georgia	1:18-op-45563	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Columbus (GA)	1:18-op-45567	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Columbus, GA	1:18-op-45567	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
County of Overton, TN	1:18-op-45568	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
City of Concord, New Hampshire; City of Dover, New Hampshire	1:18-op-45573	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 32. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Tattnall County (GA)	1:18-op-45574	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45574	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45574	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Tattnall County, Georgia	1:18-op-45574	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Woodbury, Georgia	1:18-op-45575	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
City of Woodbury, Georgia	1:18-op-45575	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Toombs County (GA)	1:18-op-45576	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Toombs County, Georgia	1:18-op-45576	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
County of Macon, Georgia	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Macon County, Georgia	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
The County of Macon, Georgia	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Macon County, GA	1:18-op-45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Newton County (GA)	1:18-op-45578	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	No			
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Newton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45578	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
County of Peach, Georgia	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	

					Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies				
Peach County, GA	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes			Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	
The County of Peach, Georgia	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Peach County, GA	1:18-op-45579	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
County of Schley, Georgia	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Schley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
The County of Schley, Georgia	1:18-op-45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
Jackson County (GA)	1:18-op-45581	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Jackson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45581	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Huntington Beach, California	1:18-op-45588	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Robinson Calcagnie	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Tulalip Tribes, WA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45589				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Tulalip Tribes, WA v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45589	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.		N/A	SuperValu	No			Plaintiff is a Tribe and was incorrectly listed by Defendant on Defendant's service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. Defendant does not contend that it was not served with process. In addition, as Defendant expressly acknowledges (see #4836 at 2), the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of Kent, Washington	1:18-op-45590	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Evansville (IN)	1:18-op-45591	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
City of Paducah, Kentucky	1:18-op-45592	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
City of Paducah, KY	1:18-op-45592	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
County of Ballard, Kentucky	1:18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
The County of Ballard, Kentucky	1:18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, Illinois	1:18-op-45594	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, IL	1:18-op-45594	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		

Town of Salisbury, MA	1:18-op-45595	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Princeton, Illinois	1:18-op-45599	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Princeton, IL	1:18-op-45599	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Los Angeles, California	1:18-op-45601	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 38. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court’s recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Worth County (GA)	1:18-op-45602	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Worth County, Georgia	1:18-op-45602	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Fitzgerald , Georgia	1:18-op-45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Fitzgerald, Georgia	1:18-op-45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Fitzgerald (GA)	1:18-op-45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
The City of Fitzgerald, Georgia	1:18-op-45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Forsyth County (NC)	1:18-op-45605	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
Columbia County (GA)	1:18-op-45607	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Columbia County, Georgia	1:18-op-45607	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Columbia County, Georgia	1:18-op-45607	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Columbia County, Georgia	1:18-op-45607	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
County of McCracken, Kentucky	1:18-op-45611	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
County of McCracken, KY	1:18-op-45611	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Clallam County, WA	1:18-op-45612	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Clallam County, Washington	1:18-op-45612	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.



Bergen County, NJ	1:18-op-45616	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Frostburg v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation, et al.	1:18-op-45617	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
City of Hagerstown, Maryland	1:18-op-45622	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
City of Hagerstown, Maryland v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al.	1:18-op-45622	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
City of Hagerstown, MD	1:18-op-45622	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	No	3/23/2023	
City of Cumberland, Maryland v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al.	1:18-op-45624	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
Carbon County, WY	1:18-op-45625	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Associated Pharmacies, Inc. on 2/20/23. Counsel for Associated Pharmacies stated in response that it would not execute the waiver of service, but was willing to accept service on the client's behalf.
County of Carbon, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Carbon County, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
County of Carbon, Wyoming	1:18-op-45625	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
Arizona Counties Insurance Pool	1:18-op-45632	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
The Arizona Counties Insurance Pool	1:18-op-45632	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
City of Bridgeport (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Henagar (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

City of New Hope (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Scottsboro (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, Alabama et al.	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, Alabama; City of Bridgeport, Alabama; City of Henagar, Alabama; City of New Hope, Alabama; City of Scottsboro, Alabama; Town of Geraldine, Alabama; Town of Woodville, Alabama	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

Town of Geraldine (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Woodville (AL)	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Jackson County, AL, Cities of Bridgeport, Henagar, New Hope, and Scottsboro, AL, and Towns of Geraldine and Woodville, AL	1:18-op-45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Mayfield Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45635	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Mayfield Heights, OH	1:18-op-45635	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Lyndhurst, Ohio	1:18-op-45636	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Lyndhurst, OH	1:18-op-45636	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
City of Wickliffe, Ohio	1:18-op-45637	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Wickliffe, OH	1:18-op-45637	Kelley & Ferraro	No	2/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Allegany County, Maryland v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation et al.	1:18-op-45652	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
County of Marin, California	1:18-op-45657	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 13, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 51. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Winston-Salem (NC)	1:18-op-45658	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Dallas County, AL	1:18-op-45667	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
County of Osceola, Florida	1:18-op-45669	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Osceola, Florida	1:18-op-45669	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	

Wilkinson County (GA)	1:18-op-45671	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	03/02/2023	
Monroe County, GA	1:18-op-45672	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	03/02/2023	
Monroe County, GA	1:18-op-45672	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
Town of Watertown, MA	1:18-op-45674	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
County of Santa Cruz, California	1:18-op-45679	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 64. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court’s recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Dare County, NC	1:18-op-45683	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	
City of Wilmington (NC)	1:18-op-45684	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Alachua County, Florida	1:18-op-45685	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
County of Alachua, Florida	1:18-op-45685	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Town of Southbridge, MA	1:18-op-45686	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
Town of Winchendon, MA	1:18-op-45687	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/18/2020	
Town of Charlton, MA	1:18-op-45689	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
City of Logansport, Indiana	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Logansport, Indiana	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Logansport, Indiana	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Logansport, IN	1:18-op-45692	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
City of Holyoke, MA	1:18-op-45694	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, Nevada	1:18-op-45699				Hikma	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
St. Petersburg, FL	1:18-op-45701	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
City of North Adams (MA)	1:18-op-45702	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
Town of Douglas, MA	1:18-op-45706	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/23/2020	
Town of Dudley, MA	1:18-op-45707	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/20/2020	
Town of Hopedale, MA	1:18-op-45708	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/20/2020	
City of Leominster, MA	1:18-op-45710	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/24/2020	
Town of Northbridge, MA	1:18-op-45711	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/19/2020	
Dooly County (GA)	1:18-op-45712	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			

Dooly County, Georgia	1:18-op-45712	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Charlton County (GA)	1:18-op-45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/5/20.
Charlton County, GA	1:18-op-45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	5/23/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/23/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Charlton County, Georgia	1:18-op-45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Brantley County (GA)	1:18-op-45714	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 1/30/20.
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Brantley County, Georgia	1:18-op-45714	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Troup County (GA)	1:18-op-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Troup County, Georgia	1:18-op-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Johnson County (GA)	1:18-op-45716	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Johnson County, Georgia	1:18-op-45716	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Camden County (GA)	1:18-op-45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/12/20.
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Camden County, Georgia	1:18-op-45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
County of Reno, Kansas	1:18-op-45718	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Reno County, Kansas	1:18-op-45718	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Lincoln County, NC	1:18-op-45719	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Escambia County, FL	1:18-op-45729	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Nez Perce Tribe, ID v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45730				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).



Nez Perce Tribe, ID v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45730	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.		N/A	SuperValu	No			Plaintiff is a Tribe and was incorrectly listed by Defendant on Defendant's service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. Defendant does not contend that it was not served with process. In addition, as Defendant expressly acknowledges (see #4836 at 2), the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Chilton County, AL	1:18-op-45735	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
(1) Conejos County, CO; (2) Las Animas County, CO; (3) Chafee County, CO; (4) Otero County, CO; (5) Alamosa County, CO; and (6) City of Alamosa, CO	1:18-op-45740	Speights, Worrich, Newcomb, Roth & Mitchell LLC	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		Thought that we had effectuated service, as we did with the other defendants, but it appears that we did not.
Pinellas County, FL	1:18-op-45742	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
Seneca Nation	1:18-op-45746	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	3/6/2023	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Cabarrus County (NC)	1:18-op-45747	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
Cabarrus County, NC	1:18-op-45747	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
The Blackfeet Tribe of The Blackfeet Indian Reservation, MT v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corp., et al.	1:18-op-45749				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Blackfeet Tribe	1:18-op-45749	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		SuperValu	Yes	Yes	8/27/2020	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Blackfeet Tribe	1:18-op-45749	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No		N/A	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
County of Napa, CA	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Novartis AG	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 18, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 57. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Novartis AG to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Novartis AG care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Novartis has been on notice since April 18, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Novartis AG have been effectively cured.
County of Napa, CA	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 18, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 57. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Sandoz International GmbH to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Sandoz International GmbH care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Sandoz has been on notice since April 18, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Sandoz International GmbH have been effectively cured.
Napa County, California	1:18-op-45750	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 12, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 56. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.



St. Bernard Parish Government	1:18-OP-45756	Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	TopRx	Yes	In Process		
St. Bernard Parish, LA Government	1:18-op-45756	Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		
St. Bernard Parish Government, LA	1:18-op-45756	Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Gwinett County, Georgia	1:18-op-45758	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Parma Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45773	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Iredell County (NC)	1:18-op-45774	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/30/2019	
Iredell County, NC	1:18-op-45774	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
Stone County (MS)	1:18-op-45775	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
Board of Commissioners of the County of Santa Fe, NM	1:18-op-45776	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Perry County (MS)	1:18-op-45778	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	10/9/2019	
County of Volusia (FL)	1:18-op-45782	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
County of Volusia, FL	1:18-op-45782	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	11/17/2020	
Holmes County (MS)	1:18-op-45793	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/3/2019	
Rowan County (NC)	1:18-op-45799	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Pinellas Park, FL	1:18-op-45807	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Cobb County (GA)	1:18-op-45817	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
(1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Our Lady of Bellefonte Hospital, Inc.; and (3) Bellefonte Physician Services, Inc.	1:18-op-45819	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
(1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Bon Secours – Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; (3) Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; (4) Bon Secours – Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; (5) Bon Secours – St. Mary’s Hospital of Richmond, Inc.; (6) Bon Secours – Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; (7) Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; (8) Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated; and (9) Maryview Hospital	1:18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/11/2019	

(1) Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; (2) Bon Secours - St. Francis Xavier Hospital, Inc.; (3) St. Francis Hospital, Inc.; and (4) St. Francis Physicia Services, Inc.	1:18-op-45821	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies, Inc. and American Assoiated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/11/2019	
Bon Secours Health System, Inc., et al v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45822	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	
Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana	1:18-op-45825				Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Morgan County, IN	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Morgan County, Indiana	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Morgan County, Indiana	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Morgan County, IN	1:18-op-45828	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
San Juan County, NM	1:18-op-45829	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Adams County (MS)	1:18-op-45831	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/22/2019	
Green Lake County, WI	1:18-op-45832	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Green Lake County, Wisconsin	1:18-op-45832	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Green Lake County, WI et al	1:18-op-45832	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Taylor County, WI	1:18-op-45832	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Vilas County, WI	1:18-op-45832	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Berrien County (GA)	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Berrien County, GA	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
Berrien County, Georgia	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
Berrien County, Georgia v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporaiton, et al.	1:18-op-45834	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lowndes County (GA)	1:18-op-45835	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 23, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lowndes County, Georgia	1:18-op-45835	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Newburyport, MA	1:18-op-45837	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
Lafayette County, MO	1:18-op-45840	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/12/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 7/12/2019, and refiled on 2/16/2023.
Jeffrey F. Wiley (Sheriff of Ascension Parish), Louisiana	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			

Jeffrey F. Wiley, Duly Elected Sheriff of Ascension Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Ascension Parish Sheriff's Office and the Ascension Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Jeffrey F. Wiley, Ascension Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Jeffrey F. Wiley, Duly Elected Sheriff of Ascension Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Ascension Parish Sheriff's Office and the Ascension Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Jeffrey F. Wiley, Sheriff of Ascension Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Wiley (Sheriff of Ascension Parish), LA	1:18-op-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Columbus County, NC	1:18-op-45847	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
Harvey County, Kansas	1:18-op-45848	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Harvey County, Kansas	1:18-op-45848	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
County of Sonoma, California	1:18-op-45849	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 62. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Pasco County (FL)	1:18-op-45851	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/14/2020	
Pasco County, FL	1:18-op-45851	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/14/2020	
Harford County, Maryland; Caroline County, Maryland; Garrett County, Maryland; Frederick County, Maryland; Talbot County, Maryland; City of Frederick, Maryland; the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland; City of Bowie, Maryland; the Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland	1:18-op-45853	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 11, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 26. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
Harford County, MD	1:18-op-45853	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V.	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V., Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entities – Ahold U.S.A., Inc., and American Sales Company, Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. to counsel of record. Plaintiffs also served Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. care of Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Koninklijke Ahold Dehaize N.V. has been on notice since April 11, 2019 and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Koninklijke Ahold Delhaize N.V. have been effectively cured.

Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Cochise County, Arizona	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Cochise County, AZ	1:18-op-45855	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Santa Rosa County (FL)	1:18-op-45861	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	11/25/2020	
County of Montcalm, MI	1:18-op-45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Montcalm, Michigan	1:18-op-45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Houghton, MI	1:18-op-45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.

County of Houghton, Michigan	1:18-op-45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Cass, MI	1:18-op-45868	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Cass, Michigan	1:18-op-45868	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Tuscola, MI	1:18-op-45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Tuscola, Michigan	1:18-op-45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Alpena, MI	1:18-op-45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Alpena, Michigan	1:18-op-45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
North Miami, FL	1:18-op-45872	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/8/2020	
Miami Gardens, FL	1:18-op-45873	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/7/2020	
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township	1:18-op-45876	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 642	Zydus	Yes	No		
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township	1:18-op-45876	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 650	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No		API/AAP’s own status report indicates that waiver was unreasonably withheld. It indicates that the waiver was received by API/AAP, but that it was more than 90 days after API/AAP was named. Given the complete lack of prejudice since API/AAP was stayed, it is unreasonable to refuse to waive service.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township	1:18-op-45876	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 647	Apotex	No			
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Indian Township, ME v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45876	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 645	SuperValu	No			
County of Riverside, CA	1:18-op-45878	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Dakota Drug	Yes			Not Named in Complaint
Town of Clarksburg (MA)	1:18-op-45882	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	4/8/2021	
Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriff’s Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Michael Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), Louisiana	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Michael Tubbs, Duly Elected Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, in his Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Morehouse Parish Sheriffi’s Office and the Morehouse Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			



Michael Tubbs, Morehouse Parish Sheriff	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Michael Tubbs, Sheriff of Morehouse Parish, Louisiana	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Tubbs (Sheriff of Morehouse Parish), LA	1:18-op-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Washtenaw, MI	1:18-op-45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Washtenaw, Michigan	1:18-op-45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Berrien, MI	1:18-op-45887	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Berrien, Michigan	1:18-op-45887	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Iron, MI	1:18-op-45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Iron, Michigan	1:18-op-45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Clinton, MI	1:18-op-45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Clinton, Michigan	1:18-op-45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ontongon, MI	1:18-op-45893	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Ontonagon, Michigan	1:18-op-45893	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Presque Isle, MI	1:18-op-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Presque Isle, Michigan	1:18-op-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of St. Clair, MI	1:18-op-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of St. Clair, Michigan	1:18-op-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Charlevoix, MI	1:18-op-45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Charlevoix, Michigan	1:18-op-45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Polk County (NC)	1:18-op-45900	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/18/2019	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Traverse City, MI	1:18-op-45901	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Traverse City, Michigan	1:18-op-45901	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of East Lansing, MI	1:18-op-45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of East Lansing, Michigan	1:18-op-45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Westland, MI	1:18-op-45903	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Westland, Michigan	1:18-op-45903	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Jackson, MI	1:18-op-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Jackson, Michigan	1:18-op-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Cannon County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45924	LCHB	No	3/15/2023	Amneal	No			
Cannon County, Tennessee	1:18-op-45924	LCHB	No	3/15/2023	Mylan	No			



									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Sault Ste. Marie, MI	1:18-op-45928	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
City of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan	1:18-op-45928	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Gary, Indiana	1:18-op-45929	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Gary, Indiana	1:18-op-45929	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
County of Hudson New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
County of Hudson, New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
County of Hudson, New Jersey	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
County of Hudson, NJ	1:18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Humboldt County, California	1:18-op-45942	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Spokane County, Washington	1:18-op-45943	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.

Franklin County, Washington	1:18-op-45944	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Laurens County (GA)	1:18-op-45945	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Laurens County, GA	1:18-op-45945	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
Houston County (GA)	1:18-op-45946	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
City of Jersey City, NJ	1:18-op-45948	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of New Albany, MS	1:18-op-45949	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/8/2019	
Gulf County (FL)	1:18-op-45953	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
Gulf County, FL	1:18-op-45953	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	12/29/2020	
Whatcom County, Washington	1:18-op-45954	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Kitsap County, Washington	1:18-op-45956	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Kitsap County, Washington	1:18-op-45956	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	No			
Red Lake Band of Chippewa	1:18-op-45959	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	03/03/23	Tribes were not required to submit PFS.
Delaware County, IN	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	A waiver of service request was sent to defense counsel originally on 6/7/2019, but we did not receive the signed waiver, even though Defendant returned similar waivers. A renewed waiver of service has been emailed to Defense counsel but has not been returned. We perfected service via process server on 2/21/2023 and filed proof of service in the individual case. A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, Indiana	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018
Delaware County, IN	1:18-op-45963	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/17/2018

									<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).</p> <p>Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>API - listed as no service of process . (Doc No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On April 14, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On June 7, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>•On June 10, 2019, another email was forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>•On June 10, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., saying said she would review and get back to us.</p>
Village of Herkimer, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45964	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Jackson County, Missouri	1:18-op-45965	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
Jackson County, Missouri	1:18-op-45965	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
									<p>Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Per Masters submission,</p> <p>they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.</p> <p>•On May 30, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Lebanon, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated May 30, 2019 on file for Masters Pharma was filed on June 9, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45967 Doc No. 90).</p> <p>•On February 13, 2023, emails were forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.</p>
City of Covington, KY	1:18-op-45967	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
Meridian, MS	1:18-op-45969	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	10/8/2019	
Upper Sioux Community	1:18-op-45974				Dakota Drug	No			<p>The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).</p>
Lower Sioux Community in the State of Minnesota	1:18-op-45976				Dakota Drug	No			<p>The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).</p>

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community	1:18-op-45977				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Cherokee County (NC)	1:18-op-45979	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Brooks County, GA	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Novartis Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Brooks County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Brooks County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-45981	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Island County, WA	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	No	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Island County, Washington	1:18-op-45982	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	No			
Allamakee County, IA	1:18-op-45983	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Allamakee County, IA	1:18-OP-45983 (S.D. Iowa)	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/4/2019	
St. John the Baptist Parish	1:18-op-45987	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
St. John the Baptist, LA	1:18-op-45987	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	02/23/2023	
Walworth County, WI	1:18-op-45988	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech			3/25/2021	
Essex County, NJ	1:18-op-45989	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Lenoir County (NC)	1:18-op-45991	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
The Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana	1:18-op-45996				Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Sonoma, California	1:18-op-45997				Mylan	Yes			incorrect case number - should be 18-45849 - responded to by Robbins Geller under correct case number
County of Tulare, California	1:18-op-45997	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 60. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on March 2, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
City of Garfield Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45999	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Garfield Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-45999	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Town of Sheffield (MA)	1:18-op-46001	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	4/8/2021	

Town of Lake Providence (LA)	1:18-op-46002	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/10/2019	Counsel for Plaintiff received the executed waiver of service from counsel for JM Smith Corporation (John J. Haggerty c/o Stephan A. Cornell; Fox Rothschild LLP) via email on April 10, 2019. The executed waiver form was filed into the case docket on May 29, 2019 (1:18-op-460002; R. Doc. 9, at 4).  PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
County of Portage, Ohio, et al. v. Cardinal Health, Inc., et al.	1:18-op-46006	Motley Rice	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/10/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for the County of Portage, Ohio, case no. 1:18-op-46006, was signed and returned by counsel James Hankle on behalf of Value Drug Co. on 4/10/2019 and filed on case docket as ECF 10 on 7/30/2019, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
Kittitas County, WA	1:18-op-46008	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Kittitas County, Washington	1:18-op-46008	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Whitman County, Washington	1:18-op-46009	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Walla Walla County, Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Walla Walla County, Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Walla Walla County, Washington	1:18-op-46010	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of North Olmsted, Ohio	1:18-op-46012	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of North Olmsted, Ohio	1:18-op-46012	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Euclid, Ohio	1:18-op-46013	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Euclid, Ohio	1:18-op-46013	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Olmsted Falls, Ohio	1:18-op-46014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/13/2023	
City of Olmsted Falls, Ohio	1:18-op-46014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of North Ridgeville (OH)	1:18-op-46015	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Prescription Supply	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of North Ridgeville, Ohio	1:18-op-46015	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Olympia, Washington	1:18-op-46021	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Jefferson County, WA	1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Jefferson County, Washington	1:18-op-46023	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46026	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46026	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Laredo, Texas	1:18-op-46026	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Kansas City, Missouri	1:18-op-46029	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Kansas, Missouri	1:18-op-46029	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Eagle Pass, Texas	1:18-op-46033	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	

Township of Painesville, Ohio	1:18-op-46035	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Berlin County, NH	1:18-op-46040	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
City of Berlin, New Hampshire	1:18-op-46040	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Northwest Arizona Employee Benefit Trust	1:18-op-46043	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Kingman, Arizona	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Kingman, AZ	1:18-op-46057	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
St. Charles County, Missouri	1:18-op-46059	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
St. Charles County, Missouri	1:18-op-46059	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
Board of County Commissioners	1:18-op-46060	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	5/5/2020	
(1) Adams County, ID; (2) Blaine County, ID; (3) Boise County, ID; (4) Bonneville County, ID; (5) Caribou County, ID; (6) Cassia County, ID; (7) Elmore County, ID; (8) Latah County, ID; (9) Minidoka County, ID; (10) Owyhee County, ID; and (11) Payette County, ID	1:18-op-46062	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
Adams County et al., ID	1:18-op-46062	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Shreveport, Louisiana	1:18-op-46064	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			
Lanier County (GA)	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lanier County, GA	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lanier County, Georgia	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Lanier County, Georgia	1:18-op-46066	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
Madison County (NC)	1:18-op-46067	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	
Yancey County (NC)	1:18-op-46071	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Scott County Board of Supervisors (VA)	1:18-op-46074	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/20/2019	
Smyth County (VA)	1:18-op-46077	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/16/2019	Executed Waiver of Service filed on 7/16/2019, and refiled on 2/21/2023.



Lafayette General Health System, Inc.	1:18-op-46082	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Opelousas General Hospital, a Louisiana Public Trust	1:18-op-46083	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Clanton, AL	1:18-op-46084	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/2/2020	
Town of Kingston, MA	1:18-op-46090	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/10/2023	KVK-Tech	No		N/A	Plaintiff's PFS was uploaded to the repository on 1/10/23.
City of Eureka, California, et al.	1:18-op-46092	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The Fiscal Court of Wolfe County (KY)	1:18-op-46099	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
City of Rochester, N.H, et al.	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022	Hikma	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire, et al.	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022	Amneal	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire, et al.	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022	KVK-Tech	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
City of Rochester, New Hampshire; Merrimack County, New Hampshire	1:18-op-46106	Andrus Anderson LLP	No	12/11/2022	Mylan	No			Delay in submitting PFS to repository was inadvertent, has been cured, and is not prejudicial.
Pulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
Pulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
Pulaski County, Indiana	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
Pulaski County, IN	1:18-op-46110	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 12/26/2018
City of Strongsville, Ohio	1:18-op-46111	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Strongsville, Ohio	1:18-op-46111	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Glynn County (GA)	1:18-op-46115	Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter, Strickland & Watkins, LLP	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	No			Glynn County's PFS was originally emailed on 1/14/19 to Liaison Counsel.
Glynn County, Georgia	1:18-op-46115	Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter, Strickland & Watkins, LLP	No	2/20/2023	Hikma	No			Glynn County's PFS was originally emailed on 1/14/19 to Liaison Counsel.

Glynn County, Georgia	1:18-op-46115	Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter, Strickland & Watkins, LLP	No	2/20/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, <i>shall</i> grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” See MDL 2804 ECF No. 232, at 10 (italics supplied).</p> <p>On March 21, 2019, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia mailed the following to Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s registered agent: Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons; Waiver of the Service of Summons (2 copies); Short Form Complaint; and a Self-addressed stamped envelope.</p> <p>On February 19, 2023, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia emailed counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., identifying the above-referenced materials that were previously transmitted and requested the signed waiver.</p> <p>On March 3, 2023, counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., responded, "We are in receipt of your email requesting that Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., waive service of an amended complaint that was filed on March 18, 2019. The request for waiver is untimely, as this case was filed nearly four years ago. Setting that issue aside, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., is an improperly named holding company, and it has not manufactured, promoted, distributed, supplied, or sold any opioid-containing products. As noted in your email, Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC has already waived service in this case. Accordingly, we request that you dismiss Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc. from this case. Please let us know if you would like to discuss this issue further."</p> <p>On March 21, 2023, counsel for Glynn County, Georgia replied, "Thank you for your response. In your email, you write, 'We are in receipt of your email requesting that Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., waive service of an amended complaint that was filed on March 18, 2019. The request for waiver is untimely, as this case was filed nearly four years ago.' The Short Form Complaint adding Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., was filed on March 18, 2019, and I mailed the following on March 21, 2019 (less than one week after adding Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.): Notice of a Lawsuit and Request to Waive Service of a Summons; Waiver of the Service of Summons (2 copies); Short Form Complaint; a self-addressed stamped envelope; and a cover letter from me. Thus, I would respectfully submit that the request for a waiver was timely. Further, I</p>
Glynn County, GA	1:18-op-46115	Brown, Readdick, Bumgartner, Carter, Strickland & Watkins, LLP	No	2/20/2023	Indivior	No		Glynn County's PFS was originally emailed on 1/14/19 to Liaison Counsel.
Borough of Ridgefield, New Jersey	1:18-op-46117	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023
Borough of Ridgefield, New Jersey	1:18-op-46117	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023
Levy County, Florida	1:18-op-46119	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023
Levy County, Florida	1:18-op-46119	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023
Letcher County Fiscal Court (KY)	1:18-op-46124	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020
Town of Clendenin, WV	1:18-op-46127	Motley Rice	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process	Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel's new Masters signatory.
Chelan County, WA	1:18-op-46139	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023
Chelan County, Washington	1:18-op-46139	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023
City of Portland, Indiana	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023
City of Portland, Indiana, et al.	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No		
City of Portland, Indiana; Jay County, Indiana	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No		
City of Portland and Jay County, IN	1:18-op-46140	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No		
Robeson County (NC)	1:18-op-46141	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No		

Robeson County, NC	1:18-op-46141	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
Fiscal Court of Montgomery County (KY)	1:18-op-46144	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Schuyler County, IL v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46147	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	8/28/2019	
County of Johnson, IL	1:18-op-46148	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith			8/26/2019	Defendant error alleging late PFS upload.
Hospital Service District No. 1 of the Parish of LaSalle	1:18-op-46150	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hospitals, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Ripley County, Indiana	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
Ripley County, Indiana	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
Ripley County, Indiana	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
Ripley County, IN	1:18-op-46155	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/15/2019
Town of Upton, MA	1:18-op-46160	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	12/9/2023	KVK-Tech	No		N/A	PFS was sent to Liaison Counsel on or before 10/14/22. However, Liaison Counsel contracted Plaintiff's Counsel on 12/9/2022 and indicated that a Defense Counsel paralegal could not locate the PFS. On 12/9/22, the PFS was re-transmitted to Liason Counsel and uploaded to the repository.
Tazewell County (VA)	1:18-op-46167	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to John Haggerty, Fox Rothschild, on 5/28/2019 and on 2/22/2023.
Livingston County, MO	1:18-OP-46168 (W.D. M	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Hy-Vee	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Michael P. Jurgens, 5820 Westown Parkway, West Des Moines, IA 50266 on 6/14/2019, and to Cameron Grant, Scharnhorst, Ast Kennard Griffin, PC. on 2/17/2023.
City of Syracuse, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P.	1:18-op-46169	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548).</p> <p>Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>API - listed as no service of process . (Doc. No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On April 6, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On May 28, 2019, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>•On May 31, 2019, a further email was sent to Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq. regarding our request for Waivers.</p> <p>•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case Doc 1:18-op-46169 Doc Nos. 79 and 80).</p>
Lee County (GA)	1:18-op-46171	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Lee County, GA	1:18-op-46171	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	
Lee County, GA	1:18-op-46171	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/15/2021	

Board of Commissioners for Lucas County, Ohio; Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, Ohio; Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees, Ohio	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
Board of Commissioners of Lucas County (OH)	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Prescription Supply	No			
Board of Commissioners of Lucas County, Ohio, et al.	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
Lucas County Children Services Board of Trustees (OH)	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Prescription Supply	No			
Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Lucas County (OH)	1:18-op-46177	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Prescription Supply	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ingham, MI	1:18-op-46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Ingham, Michigan	1:18-op-46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Franklin, Indiana et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, Indiana, et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, Indiana; Town of Pendleton, Indiana; City of Richmond, Indiana	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
City of Franklin, IN, et al.	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Franklin, Town of Pendleton, and City of Richmond, IN	1:18-op-46182	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			PFS's were originally served on 1/24/2019
Ashe County (NC)	1:18-op-46185	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Newaygo, MI	1:18-op-46187	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	
County of Newaygo, Michigan	1:18-op-46187	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
Lawrence County, IN	1:18-op-46188	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
									Defendant did not list an alleged service defect in its recent filing. However, a review of the docket revealed that no waiver of service was filed. A waiver of service request was sent to defense counsel originally on 6/7/2019, but we did not receive the signed waiver, even though Defendant returned similar waivers. A renewed waiver of service was emailed to Defense counsel but Defendant would not agree to waive service. We perfected service via process server on 2/28/2023 and filed proof of service in the individual case.
Lawrence County, Indiana	1:18-op-46188	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
Lawrence County, Indiana	1:18-op-46188	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
Lawrence County, Indiana	1:18-op-46188	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
Lawrence County, IN	1:18-op-46188	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/24/2019
Cole County, MO	1:18-op-46189	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	
Reynolds County, MO v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46193	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Ozark County (MO)	1:18-op-46198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/11/2023	Hikma	No		N/A	PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.
Ozark County (MO)	1:18-op-46198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/11/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/26/2021	PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.
Ozark County, Missouri	1:18-op-46198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/11/2023	Mylan	No		N/A	PFS Uploaded on 1/11/2023.
Ozark County, MO v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/11/2023	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Ozark County, Missouri	1:18-op-46198	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/11/2023	Amneal	No		N/A	
Benton County, IN	1:18-op-46201	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019
Benton County, Indiana	1:18-op-46201	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019
Benton County, Indiana	1:18-op-46201	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019
Benton County, IN	1:18-op-46201	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 01/28/2019
Alexander County (NC)	1:18-op-46205	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
St. Tammany Parish Government, LA	1:18-op-46211	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Plains Township, Pennsylvania	1:18-op-46215	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/7/2023	

Leon County, FL	1:18-op-46242	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/23/2020	
Tallahassee, FL	1:18-op-46243	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/18/2020	
Ripley County (MO)	1:18-op-46262	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	4/1/2021	
Green County Fiscal Court, Kentucky	1:18-op-46272	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	Hikma	No			
Canyon County, ID	1:18-op-46277	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
Canyon County, ID	1:18-op-46277	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Town of Gauley Bridge, WV	1:18-OP-46278	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	12/14/2018	Waiver of the Service of Summons for the Town of Gauley Bridge, WV was signed and returned by counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 12/14/2018, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
Randy Smith, duly elected Sheriff of St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana, in his capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the St. Tammany Parish Sheriff's Office and the St. Tammany Parish Law Enforcement District, LA	1:18-op-46280	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Union County (GA)	1:18-op-46284	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
City of Boise, ID	1:18-op-46289	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
County of San Luis Obispo, California	1:18-op-46290	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiff filed its short form complaint on March 14, 2019, naming Mylan N.V. f/k/a Mylan Inc. and Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. On April 25, 2019, it served the domestic entity – Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 74. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiff sent a waiver request for Mylan N.V. to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiff also served Mylan N.V. care of Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Mylan has been on notice since April 25, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Mylan N.V. have been effectively cured.
San Juan County, WA	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
San Juan County, Washington	1:18-op-46291	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Pohlmann, Sheriff of St. Bernard Parish, LA	1:18-op-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023. (Doc. No. 33)
Pohlmann, Sheriff of St. Bernard Parish Louisiana	1:18-OP-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.



James Pohlmann, duly elected Sheriff of St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, in his capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the St. Bernard Parish Sheriff's Office and the St. Bernard Parish Law Enforcement District, LA									
Rockdale County, Georgia	1:18-op-46292	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46296	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/9/2023	
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Bogalusa, Louisiana	1:18-op-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Clayton County, Georgia	1:18-op-46298	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Warrensville Heights, Ohio	1:18-op-46299	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Coos County, Oregon	1:18-op-46300	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Lewis County, WA	1:18-op-46301	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
Lewis County, Washington	1:18-op-46301	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/28/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of McClain County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46303	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The Board of County Commissioners of McClain County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46303	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Garvin County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46304	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/30/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Garvin County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46304	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/30/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Camden County, NJ	1:18-op-46306	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Hickory (NC)	1:18-op-46307	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/10/2019	
City of Atlanta, Georgia	1:18-op-46308	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
The City of Atlanta (GA)	1:18-op-46308	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	No			
Henry County, Georgia	1:18-op-46310	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
Henry County, Georgia	1:18-op-46310	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Portland, a municipality in Cumberland County, ME	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
City of Portland, Maine	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Portland, Maine	1:18-op-46313	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Bangor, Maine	1:18-op-46314	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Lewiston, a municipality in Androscoggin County, State of Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Lewiston, Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Lewiston, Maine	1:18-op-46315	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Washington County (TN)	1:18-op-46317	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	1/20/2021	

County of San Mateo, California	1:18-op-46319	Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023	Hikma	No			The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023, despite request.
County of San Mateo, California	1:18-op-46319	Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023	Mylan	No			The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023, despite request.
Board of County Commissioners of Pawnee County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46320	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	
The Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County (OK)	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	3/9/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma, OK	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
The Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
The Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, State of Oklahoma	1:18-op-46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46322	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46323	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The Board of County Commissioners of Ottawa County, Oklahoma	1:18-op-46323	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
City of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida	1:18-op-46329	Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert; Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Hikma	No			Plaintiff timely sent its PFS to the repository.
Davidson County (NC)	1:18-op-46330	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	JM Smith	No			
Davidson County, NC	1:18-op-46330	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			

Bradenton, FL	1:18-op-46331	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/2/2020	
Commissioners of St. Mary's County (MD)	1:18-op-46334	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
City of Albany (GA)	1:18-op-46337	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/6/2021	
City of Albany, Georgia	1:18-op-46337	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	
Albany, GA	1:18-op-46337	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Grady County (GA)	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed waiver
Grady County, Georgia	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to Mylan Inc; pending receipt of signed waiver
Grady County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Grady County, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:18-op-46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Findlay, Ohio	1:18-op-46339	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Forest County Potawatomi Community	1:18-op-46342				Dakota Drug	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Roosevelt County, New Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
The County of Roosevelt, New Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Roosevelt County, New Mexico	1:18-op-46343	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Allen, Auglaize, and Hardin Counties, Ohio	1:18-op-46344	Spangenberg Shibley & Liber	No	1/28/2023	Amneal	No			As owner of the repository, we were the first to submit our clients PFSs. Due to a technical glitch, this PFS was not transferred into the new repository.
City of Kenova, WV	1:18-OP-46346	Motley Rice	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	1/4/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for the City of Kenova, WV was signed and returned by counsel Allen Lopus on behalf of Top Rx, LLC on 12/14/2018, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
Webster County (MO)	1:18-op-46350	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/1/2021	
Webster County, Missouri	1:18-op-46350	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	Amneal	No		N/A	
Webster County, MO v. Purdue Pharma LP et al	1:18-op-46350	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No	1/31/2023	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Hillsborough County, New Hampshire	1:18-op-46353	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	

City of Utica, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P.	1:18-op-46359	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p><i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On April 1, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On April 24, another email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq. requesting him to sign and return the Waivers.</p> <p>•On May 19, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:18-op-46359 Doc Nos. 68 and 69).</p> <p>•On May 28, 2019, a follow up email was sent to Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p>
Johnson County, MO v. Purdue Pharma, L.P. et al	1:19-op- 45363-DAP	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	12/3/2019	Pharmacy Buying Association states in their submission to the Court that service was effective in 2019.
County of Kent, MI	1:19-op-45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/21/2019	<p>In 2019, each of W&amp;L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&amp;L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&amp;L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&amp;L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&amp;L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&amp;L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&amp;L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz &amp; Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&amp;L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&amp;L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.</p>
City of New Orleans, Louisiana	1:19-op-45003	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
City of New Orleans, Louisiana	1:19-op-45003	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
City of New Orleans, LA	1:19-op-45003	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.

Gary Gilley, Duly Elected Sheriff of Richland Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Richland Parish Sheriff's Office and the Richland Parish Law Enforcement District	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Gary Gilley (Sheriff of Richland Parish), Louisiana	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Gary Gilley, Duly Elected Sheriff of Richland Parish, in His Capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Richland Parish Sheriff's Office and the Richland Parish Law Enforcement District (LA)	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	No			
Gary Gilley, Richland Parish Sheriff	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	11/1/2019	
Gary Gilley, Sheriff of Richland Parish, Louisiana	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Gilley (Sheriff of Richland Parish), LA	1:19-op-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Northern Cheyenne Tribe, MT v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45010				SuperValu	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of New Roads, Louisiana	1:19-op-45011	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Hikma	No			
City of New Roads, Louisiana	1:19-op-45011	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Mylan	No			
City of New Roads, Louisiana	1:19-op-45011	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Amneal	No			
New Roads, LA	1:19-op-45011	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Winn-Dixie	No			
City of New Roads, LA	1:19-op-45011	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Indivior	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Point Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Mylan	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Hikma	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, Louisiana	1:19-op-45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Amneal	No			
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, LA	1:19-op-45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Indivior	No			

Policy Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, LA	1:19-op-45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Winn-Dixie	No			
City of Saint Martinville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45013	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
Saint Martinville, LA	1:19-op-45013	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	2/2/2023	
Haywood County (NC)	1:19-op-45014	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/15/2019	
County of Maricopa, Arizona	1:19-op-45020	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Ascension Parish Government	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023. (Waiver of Service executed in October 2022 filed 2-13-2022.)
Ascension Parish Government, Louisiana	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Ascension Parish Government, Louisiana	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Ascension Parish Government, LA	1:19-op-45027	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
City of Donaldsonville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
City of Donaldsonville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	Waiver of service executed in October 2022. Filed executed waiver of service into record 2/13/2023. Defendant removed from Amended Notice.
City of Donaldsonville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
City of Donaldsonville, LA	1:19-op-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
City of Anacortes and Sedro-Woolley School District, Washington	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Anacortes and Sedro-Woolley School District, Washington	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Anacortes, Washington et al.	1:19-op-45029	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Fitchburg, Massachusetts	1:19-op-45030	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Fitchburg, Massachusetts	1:19-op-45030	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Sweetwater County, Wyoming	1:19-op-45031	Schwartz Bon			Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/26/2019	Service waivers were sent to Amneal lead counsel Paul Cosgrove per his request on April 26, 2019. He agreed to waive service on behalf of his client. Believing Amneal's position on service to be in error, we re-sent service waivers as Cosgrove had requested back in 2019. Cosgrove's associate responded to advise they would not waive service as they had agreed to do. We believe service has been effected on Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC in accordance with federal rules.
County of McKinley, NM	1:19-op-45033	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	7/19/2021	
City of Thornton, Colorado	1:19-op-45034	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.



Board of County Commissioners of the County of Jefferson, Colorado	1:19-op-45035	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Adams, CO	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Adams, Colorado et al.	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Adams, Colorado	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Adams, Colorado	1:19-op-45036	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Bartow County (GA)	1:19-op-45045	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/2/2023	
Polk County (GA)	1:19-op-45046	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	8/29/2019	
Kentucky River District Health Department	1:19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	6/3/2019	
Rio Arriba County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45054	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Town of Scituate, MA	1:19-op-45063	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Ahold Delhaize	Yes	Yes	5/8/2020	
Town of Scituate, MA	1:19-op-45063	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		American Sales Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	5/8/2020	
County of Brevard, Florida	1:19-op-45064	LCHB	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. No response. Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
County of Brevard, Florida	1:19-op-45064	LCHB	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. Defendants replied that they will not waive service. Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/20/2023.
City of Preston, ID	1:19-op-45067	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
County of Douglas, Nebraska	1:19-op-45068	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			
Douglas County, NE	1:19-OP-45068 (D. Neb	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	6/2/2019	
Porter County, Indiana	1:19-op-45074	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Amneal	No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
Porter County, Indiana	1:19-op-45074	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
Porter County, IN	1:19-op-45074	Cohen & Malad, LLP	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			A PFS was originally served on 05/15/2019
Morgan County, Tennessee	1:19-op-45075	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Casper, Wyoming	1:19-op-45079	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
County of Greenbrier, WV	1:19-op-45080	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	7/24/2019	
City of Nanticoke, Pennsylvania	1:19-op-45081	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/16/2020	
City of Great Falls, Counties of Anaconda-Deer Lodge, and Lake, and City of Missoula, MT	1:19-op-45083	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes	10/21/2022	Indivior	No			
City of Great Falls, et al., Montana	1:19-op-45083	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	10/21/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Great Falls, Montana, et al.	1:19-op-45083	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	10/21/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Coconut Creek, Florida	1:19-op-45089	LCHB	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. No response. Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.

Noble County, Ohio	1:19-op-45096	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Mylan	No			
Lincoln County, Nebraska	1:19-op-45099	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant Point	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 643	Zydus	Yes	No		
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant Point	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 651	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No		API/AAP's own status report indicates that waiver was unreasonably withheld. It indicates that the waiver was received by API/AAP, but that it was more than 90 days after API/AAP was named. Given the complete lack of prejudice since API/AAP was stayed, it is unreasonable to refuse to waive service.
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant Point	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 648	Apotex	No			
Passamaquoddy Tribe-Pleasant Point, ME v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45100	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 646	SuperValu	No			
Grant County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45108	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Grant County, NM	1:19-op-45108	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Missoula County, Montana	1:19-op-45112	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Missoula County, MT	1:19-op-45112	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/3/2023	Waiver filed 3/3/23. Dakota Drug added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Dakota Drug per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. Waiver returned 3/3/23.
Harrison County (MS)	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Request for waiver of service sent; no response.
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Hikma	No			
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Mylan	No			
Harrison County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Amneal	No			
Harrison County, MS	1:19-op-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Indivior	No			
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe	1:19-op-45114				Dakota Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Mohave, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Mohave County, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Mohave County, Arizona	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Mohave County, AZ	1:19-op-45117	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
Atkinson County (GA)	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Atkinson County, GA	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Atkinson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for Mylan Inc.; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Atkinson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Town of Dennis (MA)	1:19-op-45124	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	11/14/2019	

Town of Provincetown (MA)	1:19-op-45125	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	12/5/2019	
County of San Mateo, California	1:19-op-45126	Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023	Hikma	No			The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023, despite request.
County of San Mateo, California	1:19-op-45126	Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP	No	2/3/2023	Mylan	No			The County of San Mateo previously produced a timely PFS, which we understand was destroyed. Despite trying to monitor the voluminous docket in the MDL we missed the Order to re-submit the PFS. Once we realized the mistake we immediately corrected it. The Spangenberg database reflects upload of the PFS "February 3" with no year, we assume 2023. In other complex cases Liasion Counsel keeps non-leadership firms apprised of deadlines, that does not appear to have happened in October 2022, which would have been helpful. It was only on 2/17/23 that clear instructions were provided. Spangenberg has not provided a copy of the brief they plan to file as of 2/20/2023, despite request.
County of Santa Barbara, California et al.	1:19-op-45128	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Damascus (GA)	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
City of Arlington (GA)	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Cities of Blakely, Arlington, and Damascus, Georgia	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Blakely (GA)	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
City of Blakely, Georgia, et al.	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		
The City of Blakely, Georgia, et al.,	1:19-op-45129	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
The City of Blakely, GA	1:19-op-45129-DAP	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Heard County, Georgia	1:19-op-45130	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Hikma	No			
Blount County (TN)	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
Blount County, Tennessee, et al.	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Blount County, Tennessee; Jefferson County, Tennessee	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
Jefferson County (TN)	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
Blount County and Jefferson County, TN	1:19-op-45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		

City of Rainsville, Alabama et al	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Rainsville, Alabama; Town of Hammondville, Alabama	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Rainsville, AL and Town of Hammondville, AL	1:19-op-45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Red Bay, Alabama et al	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Red Bay, Alabama; City of Russellville, Alabama, Sheffield, Alabama; and Leighton, Alabama	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.

City of Russellville (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Sheffield (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Red Bay (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Town of Leighton (AL)	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Cities of Red Bay, Russellville, and Sheffield, AL, and Town of Leighton, AL	1:19-op-45136	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.



Iberville Parish Council, LA	1:19-op-45140	Pendley, Baudin & Coffin	No	2/22/2023	Michael Babich	Yes	No		Defendant has been dismissed
									<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Vestavia Hills, Alabama	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process		
									<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Vestavia Hills, Alabama	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		
									<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Vestavia Hills, AL	1:19-op-45141	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Doyle T. Wooten, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Coffee County (GA)	1:19-op-45145	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
Doyle T. Wooten, Sheriff of Coffee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45145	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Lewis S. Walker in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Crawford County, Georgia	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Lewis S. Walker, Sheriff of Crawford County, GA	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	9/9/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Walker (Sheriff of Crawford County), GA	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praecepto to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Lewis S. Walker, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Crawford County (GA)	1:19-op-45146	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	No			
Jolley (Sheriff of Harris County), GA	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praecepto to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Mike Jolley in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Harris County (GA)	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.



Mike Jolley in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Harris County, Georgia	1:19-op-45147	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
E. Neal Jump, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Glynn County (GA)	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
E. Neal Jump in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Glynn County, Georgia	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
E. Neal Jump, Sheriff of Glynn County, Georgia	1:19-op-45155	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Bohannon (Sheriff of Jeff Davis County), GA	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Preston Bohannon, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Jeff Davis County (GA)	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Preston Bohannon, Sheriff of Jeff Davis County, Georgia	1:19-op-45161	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
R.N. "Butch" Reece, in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff Of Jones County (GA)	1:19-op-45162	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Dean (Sheriff of Laurens County), GA	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Larry H. Dean, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Laurens County (GA)	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Larry H. Dean, Sheriff of Laurens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45163	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Gary Langford, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Murray County (GA)	1:19-op-45164	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	No			
Gary Langford, Sheriff of Murray County, Georgia	1:19-op-45164	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Scott Berry, Sheriff of Oconee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45165	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Ramsey Bennett, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Pierce County (GA)	1:19-op-45166	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Ramsey Bennett in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Pierce County, Georgia	1:19-op-45166	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Kile (Sheriff of Screven County), GA	1:19-op-45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Mike Kile in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Mike Kile, Sheriff of Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45167	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Gene Scarbrough, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Tift County (GA)	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Gene Scarbrough in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Tift County, Georgia	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Gene Scarbrough, Sheriff of Tift County, Georgia	1:19-op-45168	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			

Randy F. Royal, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Ware County (GA)	1:19-op-45169	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Randy F. Royal, Sherifff of Ware County, Georgia	1:19-op-45169	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
John G. Carter, in his official Capacity as the Sheriff of Wayne County (GA)	1:19-op-45170	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
John G. Carter, Sheriff of Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45170	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Wilkes County (GA)	1:19-op-45171	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Wilkes County, Georgia	1:19-op-45171	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Towns County (GA)	1:19-op-45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Towns County, Georgia	1:19-op-45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
McIntosh County (GA)	1:19-op-45173	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
McIntosh County, Georgia	1:19-op-45173	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
McIntosh County, Georgia	1:19-op-45173	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Cherokee County (GA)	1:19-op-45174	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/6/20
Cherokee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45174	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Cherokee County, Georgia	1:19-op-45174	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Glascock County (GA)	1:19-op-45175	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Glascock County, Georgia	1:19-op-45175	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Glascock County, Georgia	1:19-op-45175	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Pulaski County (GA)	1:19-op-45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Pulaski County, Georgia	1:19-op-45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Rabun County (GA)	1:19-op-45177	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Rabun County, Georgia	1:19-op-45177	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Rabun County, Georgia	1:19-op-45177	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Effingham County (GA)	1:19-op-45178	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			

Effingham County, Georgia	1:19-op-45178	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Pike County (GA)	1:19-op-45179	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Pike County, Georgia	1:19-op-45179	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Pike County, Georgia	1:19-op-45179	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Early County (GA)	1:19-op-45180	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Early County, Georgia	1:19-op-45180	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Early County, Georgia	1:19-op-45180	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Seminole County (GA)	1:19-op-45181	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Seminole County, Georgia	1:19-op-45181	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Seminole County, Georgia	1:19-op-45181	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Clay County (GA)	1:19-op-45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/13/20.
Clay County, GA	1:19-op-45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 5/13/20.
Clay County, Georgia	1:19-op-45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Clay County, Georgia	1:19-op-45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Stephens County (GA)	1:19-op-45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Stephens County, Georgia	1:19-op-45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Long County (GA)	1:19-op-45196	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Long County, Georgia	1:19-op-45196	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Long County, Georgia	1:19-op-45196	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Clinch County (GA)	1:19-op-45197	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.
Clinch County, Georgia	1:19-op-45197	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Clinch County, Georgia	1:19-op-45197	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Screven County (GA)	1:19-op-45198	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45198	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Screven County, Georgia	1:19-op-45198	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Springfield (GA)	1:19-op-45199	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23
City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	10/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 10/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.

City of Springfield, Georgia	1:19-op-45199	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Liberty County (GA)	1:19-op-45200	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Liberty County, Georgia	1:19-op-45200	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Liberty County, Georgia	1:19-op-45200	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Jefferson County (GA)	1:19-op-45201	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Jefferson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45201	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Jefferson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45201	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Randolph County (GA)	1:19-op-45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Randolph County, GA	1:19-op-45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Randolph County, Georgia	1:19-op-45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Randolph County, Georgia	1:19-op-45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Greene County (GA)	1:19-op-45203	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Greene County, Georgia	1:19-op-45203	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Wayne County (GA)	1:19-op-45204	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45204	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Wayne County, Georgia	1:19-op-45204	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Burke County (GA)	1:19-op-45207	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 4/3/20.
Burke County, Georgia	1:19-op-45207	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
Burke County, Georgia	1:19-op-45207	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Spalding County (GA)	1:19-op-45208	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Spalding County, GA	1:19-op-45208	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/20/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Spalding County, Georgia	1:19-op-45208	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Spalding County, Georgia	1:19-op-45208	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Emanuel County (GA)	1:19-op-45209	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Emanuel County, Georgia	1:19-op-45209	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Dawson County (GA)	1:19-op-45210	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/1/23.

Dawson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45210	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Dawson County, Georgia	1:19-op-45210	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Lumpkin County (GA)	1:19-op-45211	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Lumpkin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45211	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Lumpkin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45211	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
									Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i>
City of Geneva, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45214	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•On June 5, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</li><li>•On June 5, 2019, the email was acknowledged by Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., saying she would review and get back to our law firm.</li><li>•On June 7, 2019, Waivers were returned for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC only.</li><li>•On June 9, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-op-45214 Doc No. 59 and 60).</li><li>•On February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver</li></ul>
County of Navajo, Arizona	1:19-op-45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Navajo County, Arizona	1:19-op-45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Navajo County, Arizona	1:19-op-45217	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Memphis, Tennessee	1:19-op-45220	O'Leary, Shelton, Corrigan, Peterson, Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/20/2023	Emailed waiver request to Defendant on 2/13/23 but no reply was received from Defendant; accordingly, Alias Summons served on 2/20/23
City of Memphis, Tennessee	1:19-op-45220	O'Leary, Shelton, Corrigan, Peterson, Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Lakewood, Washington	1:19-op-45221	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Meigs County, Ohio	1:19-op-45229	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Mylan	No			
Washington County, Ohio	1:19-op-45230	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Mylan	No			

Montgomery County, Virginia	1:19-op-45234	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Montgomery County, Virginia	1:19-op-45234	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>



Giles County, Virginia v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45236	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Galax, Virginia	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Galax, VA	1:19-op-45243	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	No	Yes	2/24/2023	<p>On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel then filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision’s delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed. Further, while Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023 status report, Defendant subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case should not be dismissed against this Defendant.</p>

Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Henry County, Virginia	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Henry County, VA	1:19-op-45245	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	No	Yes	2/24/2023	On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel then filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision’s delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed. Further, while Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023 status report, Defendant subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case should not be dismissed against this Defendant.
City of Alexandria, VA	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision’s ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant’s actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where “a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and ‘presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.’” In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine

City of Alexandria, Virginia	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and 'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.'" In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine
City of Alexandria, Virginia	1:19-op-45246	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and 'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.'" In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine

Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>



									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Pittsylvania County, Virginia	1:19-op-45247	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Cullman (AL)	1:19-op-45248	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
City of Cullman, AL	1:19-op-45248	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Norton, Virginia	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Norton, VA	1:19-op-45249	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			Defendant initially disputed service in this case in its January 30, 2023 status report, but Defendant subsequently filed an amended status report that no longer disputes that it was properly served in this case. Therefore, there is no dispute about proper service and the case should not be dismissed against this Defendant.
City of Charles Town, West Virginia	1:19-op-45250	Skinner law Firm			Hikma	No			This Defendant is not named in the Complaint
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner law Firm			American Sales Company, Inc.	Yes			Dismissed 02/28/2023
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner Law Firm			Indivior	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-op-45250	Skinner Law Firm			Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed 03/22/2023
City of Charles Town, WV	1:19-OP-45250	Skinner Law Firm			TopRx	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023

Lee County, Virginia	1:19-op-45251	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Lee County, Virginia	1:19-op-45251	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Dickenson County, VA	1:19-op-45252	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	it would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision's ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant's actual notice of this lawsuit, further constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) [JT1] to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where "a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and 'presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.'" In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine
Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Washington County, Virginia	1:19-op-45254	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Crowley County, Colorado	1:19-op-45255	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
City of Seminole, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			Ds have this one titled incorrectly, sb County for case 45260
Board of County Commissioners of Seminole County, OK	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Seminole County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			

									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Ionia, MI	1:19-op-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	4/15/2019	
County of Ionia, Michigan	1:19-op-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Livingston, MI	1:19-op-45262	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	4/15/2019	
City of Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
Rock Springs, Wyoming	1:19-op-45265	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/20/23. The request was denied by Mylan.



									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. On March 28, 2019, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Page County, Virginia	1:19-op-45275	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Hikma	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Hikma on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Hikma.
City of Cheyenne, Wyoming	1:19-op-45280	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Mylan	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Mylan on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Mylan.
Jackson County, FL	1:19-op-45283	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/24/2019	
Jackson County, FL	1:19-op-45283	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	No		N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
The City of Gulfport (GA)	1:19-op-45291				JM Smith	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
The City of Gulfport, Mississippi	1:19-op-45291	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	7/23/2019 & 12/11/2022	Amneal	No			
Montgomery County (GA)	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Montgomery County, GA	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Mylan	No			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Amneal	No			
Montgomery County, Georgia	1:19-op-45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Hikma	No			
Fayette County (GA)	1:19-op-45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	5/6/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 5/6/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Fayette County, Georgia	1:19-op-45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			

City of Prestonsburg (KY)	1:19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	1:19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		
The City of Prestonburg, Kentucky	1:19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
The City of Prestonsburg (KY)	1:19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky	1:19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
R. Chris Nevils, DA of Winn Parish, Louisiana	1:19-op-45296	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	7/3/2019	<p>Request for Waiver of Service was communicated to counsel for Mylan (Rebecca Mandel) on June 5, 2019, along with a copy the pleadings and a waiver form. Counsel for Plaintiff received the executed waiver form from Rebecca Mandel on July 3, 2019 via email. The executed waiver form was filed into the case docket on July 15, 2019 (1:19-op-45296; R. Doc. 16, at 4).</p> <p>PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.</p>
City of Brighton, Colorado	1:19-op-45298	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes		3/20/2023	<p>Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.</p>
City of Lackawanna, New York v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45303	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p><i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i></p> <p>•On May 11, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.</p> <p>•On June 23, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-op-45303 Doc Nos. 53 and 54).</p> <p>•On February 10, 2023, an email was re-forwarded to Attorney Cosgrove requesting again a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</p> <p>(Note: we were aware based on an email exchange with Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq., from Ulmer &amp; Berne, LLP, from May 29, 2019, in connection with a related case, City of Utica, New York (Case No. 18-op-46359), that was filed by this law firm, that they would not agree to execute the Waivers for API, based on as follows:</p>

									Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.
									<i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i>
									Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.
									•On July 9, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated 7/9/19 for Masters Pharma was filed on August 4, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45303 Doc No. 81).
									•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
City of Lackawanna, NY	1:19-op-45303	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
City of Duluth, MN	1:19-op-45304	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
Meriwether County (GA)	1:19-op-45305	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Meriwether County, Georgia	1:19-op-45305	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Chuck Smith, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Meriwether County (GA)	1:19-op-45306	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Melton (Sheriff of Appling County), GA	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Sheriff Mark Melton, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Appling County (GA)	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
Mark Melton, Georgia	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Mark Melton, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Appling County, Georgia	1:19-op-45307	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Sheriff Cullen Talton, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Houston County (GA)	1:19-op-45308	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Cullen Talton, Georgia	1:19-op-45308	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Chris Steverson, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Telfair County (GA)	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Steverson (Sheriff of Telfair County), GA	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 2/23/2023 but not returned. No response to request to waive service (sent 3/17/2023). Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Chris Steverson, Georgia	1:19-op-45313	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Sheriff Terry Deese, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Peach County (GA)	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/23/2023.
Deese, as Sheriff of Peach County, GA	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	No			
Sheriff Terry Deese, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Peach County, Georgia	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
Terry Deese, Georgia	1:19-op-45314	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Houlton Band of Maliseet, Tribe	1:19-op-45315	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	10/24/2019	Tribes not required to file a PFS.

County of Sierra, NM	1:19-op-45322	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
Board of County Commissioners	1:19-op-45323	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	10/25/2019	
									Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i> Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.  •On July 16, 2019, Masters was served at 3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated July 16, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on August 4, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45325 Doc No. 81).  •On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
Wilkes-Barre Township, PA	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
Wilkes-Barre Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	9/8/2019	As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug’s submission. <i>Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843)</i>  •The Waivers of Service dated August 26, 2019 were filed on September 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45325 Doc Nos. 95 and 96). As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug’s submission in Doc No. 4843.
Wilkes-Barre Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma, L.P, et al.	1:19-op-45325	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver. They took a position that API was not a proper defendant based on a previous ruling in a different case, claiming that the MDL court had decided such in a 4/12/19 order. (See Doc 1548). Also, as demonstrated below, our law office has, in good faith, sent additional Waivers to correct any deemed deficiencies. Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiffs submit there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant API by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>API - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4847)</i>  •On May 19, 2019, an email was sent to Paul Cosgrove, Esq., attaching a Waiver of Service of the Summons for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, API Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.  •On July 1, 2019, an email was again sent to Attorney Cosgrove requesting signed Waivers for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, along with a copy of the filed Complaint.  •On July 1, 2019, Waivers of Service of the Summons were filed for Defendants Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. (See Case 1:19-op-45325 Doc Nos. 64 and 70).  •On July 1, 2019, an email was received from Sarah Miller Benoit, Esq. returning Waivers for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, and Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC. However, she did not return a signed Waiver for Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc., rather requested a dismissal of same,
City of Superior, WI	1:19-op-45331	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c

Scotland County (NC)	1:19-op-45336	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/19/2020	
Scotland County (NC)	1:19-op-45336	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/19/2020	
Lafayette County (MS)	1:19-op-45341	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/3/2019	
Roseau County	1:19-op-45344	Motley Rice	Yes		Thrifty Drug Stores	Yes	Yes	10/17/2019	Waiver of the Service of Summons for Roseau County, MN was signed and returned by counsel John Haggerty on behalf of Thrifty Drug Stores, Inc. d/b/a Thrifty White Warehouse #899 on 10/17/2019, which states on its face that, "If the waiver is signed and returned, [defendant] can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or service."
Aroostook Band of Micmacs	1:19-op-45349	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	No	00/00/00	Summons issued and awaiting affidavit of service. Tribes were not required to complete PFS.
Lower Brule Sious Tribe	1:19-op-45350	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	3/3/2023	Tribes were not required to submit PFS
Fairview Township, Pennsylvania	1:19-op-45355	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	03/06/2023	
White Earth Nation	1:19-op-45357	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Dakota Drug	Yes	Yes	03/03/23	Tribes were not required to submit PFS
Yellow Medicine County, MN	1:19-op-45358	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
Bannock County, ID	1:19-op-45359	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
David Davis, Sheriff of Bibb County, Georgia	1:19-op-45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/13/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/13/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 3/27/20.
David J. Davis, in his Official Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb County (GA)	1:19-op-45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	JM Smith	No			
David J. Davis, In His Official Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb County, Georgia	1:19-op-45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Hikma	No			
David J. Davis, in His Official Capacity as Sheriff of Bibb County, Georgia	1:19-op-45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Amneal	No			
William C. Massee, Jr., in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Baldwin County (GA)	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No	3/21/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
William C. Massee, Jr., in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Baldwin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Amneal	No			
William C. Massee, Jr., Sheriff of Baldwin County, Georgia	1:19-op-45361	LCHB	No	2/20/2023	Mylan	No			
Johnson County, Missouri	1:19-op-45363	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Howell County (MO)	1:19-op-45368	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	Burlington Drug Company (JM Smith) provided executed an executed waiver of service. The executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/14/2023.
Howell County, Missouri	1:19-op-45368	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
City of Harrisonville, Cass County, Missouri	1:19-op-45369	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Betram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Snohomish County, WA	1:19-op-45370	Goldfarb & Huck Roth Riojas	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			



Three Affiliated Tribes	1:19-op-45376	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Lister Frost Injury Lawyers Andrews Thornton Higgins Razmara Walkup, Melodia, Kelly & Schoenberger Robins Kaplan		N/A	Dakota Drug	No		N/A	Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Wabaunsee County Kansas and Tim Liesmann, Wabaunsee County	1:19-op-45377	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Henry Schein	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Henry Schein on 2/17/23. The request was denied by Henry Schein.
Callaway County, MO	1:19-op-45378	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Sandoz/Novartis	No	Yes	N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Callaway County, MO v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45378	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	
The City of Elkhart, Morton County, Kansas	1:19-op-45380	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County Commissioners for Elk County, Kansas, et al.	1:19-op-45382	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County Commissioners for Greenwood County, Kansas and Joe Lee, Greenwood County Attorney	1:19-op-45384	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Board of County Commissioners for Greenwood County, KS, et al v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45384-DAP	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	12/9/2023	Pharmacy Buying Association states in their submission to the Court that service was effective in 2019.
Douglas County, MO v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45386	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	
Board of County Commissioners of Finney County, Kansas, and Thomas (KS)	1:19-op-45387	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	Burlington Drug Company (JM Smith) provided executed an executed waiver of service. The executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/14/2023.
The Board of County Commissioners for Stanton County, Kansas and David Black, Stanton County Attorney	1:19-op-45388	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The City of Manter, Stanton County, Kansas	1:19-op-45389	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County Commissioners for Meade County, Kansas and Clay Kuhns, Meade County Attorney	1:19-op-45390	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The City of Ulysses, Grant County, Kansas	1:19-op-45392	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The Board of County Commissioners for Morton County, Kansas and Eric Witcher, Morton County Attorney	1:19-op-45393	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.

The Board of County Commissioners for Grant County, Kansas and Jessica Akers, Grant County Attorney	1:19-op-45394	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation	1:19-op-45395	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Lister Frost Injury Lawyers Andrews Thornton Higgins Razmara Walkup, Melodia, Kelly & Schoenberger Robins Kaplan		N/A	Dakota Drug	No		N/A	Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
City of Ada, OK	1:19-op-45400	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Gooding County, Idaho	1:19-op-45404	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
Gooding County, Idaho	1:19-op-45404	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			
Knox County, MO v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45406	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	4/15/2021	
Camas County, Idaho	1:19-op-45407	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			
Camas County, Idaho	1:19-op-45407	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
Schuyler County (MO)	1:19-op-45408	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	
Randolph County, MO v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al	1:19-op-45409	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	12/3/2019	
City of Seven Hills, Ohio	1:19-op-45413	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Seven Hills, Ohio	1:19-op-45413	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Broken Arrow, OK	1:19-op-45415	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pettis County, Missouri	1:19-op-45416	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
Pettis County, Missouri	1:19-op-45416	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
Covington County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45417	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
Covington County, Mississippi	1:19-op-45417	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
Town Of Summit, Mississippi	1:19-op-45418	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Town of Summit, Mississippi	1:19-op-45418	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Town Of Arcola, Mississippi	1:19-op-45419	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
Town of Arcola, Mississippi	1:19-op-45419	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
Forsyth County, Georgia	1:19-op-45420	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Hikma	No			
Forsyth County, Georgia	1:19-op-45420	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Mylan	No			
Sandoval County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45421	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
Sandoval County, New Mexico	1:19-op-45421	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
City Of Mound Bayou, Mississippi	1:19-op-45422	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
City of Mound Bayou, Mississippi	1:19-op-45422	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Walton County, Florida	1:19-op-45423	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
Walton County, Florida	1:19-op-45423	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			
City Of Saint Paul, Minnesota	1:19-op-45424	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
City of Saint Paul, Minnesota	1:19-op-45424	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			
Town Of Centerville Tennessee	1:19-op-45425	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/29/2022	Hikma	No			
Town of Centerville, Tennessee	1:19-op-45425	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/29/2022	Mylan	No			
Maverick County	1:19-op-45426	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023	Mylan	No			
Maverick County, Texas	1:19-op-45426	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023	Hikma	No			
Town Of Fort Deposit, Alabama	1:19-op-45427	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Hikma	No			
Town of Fort Deposit, Alabama	1:19-op-45427	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	No			

Township Of Saddle Brook, New Jersey	1:19-op-45431	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Township of Saddle Brook, New Jersey	1:19-op-45431	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
City of Hopewell, VA	1:19-op-45433	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	6/25/2019	
									In 2019, each of W&L’s clients filed an individual affidavit of service in their respective dockets. In each affidavit of service, it is noted that the person served identified themselves as a representative of Masters Pharmaceutical. Thus, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(L)(1) is satisfied and W&L’s clients’ service upon Masters is presumed valid. What’s more, in the more than three and a half years since, Masters has failed until now to raise the allegation that W&L’s clients’ service was improper. In the unlikely event that W&L’s clients’ service is deemed invalid, Masters’ delay in raising this issue more than satisfies the requirements for good cause as to W&L’s alleged deficiency in service. In addition, under Ohio law, “for a court to acquire jurisdiction there must be a proper service of summons or an entry of appearance[.]” Progressive Direct Ins. Co. v. Williams, 186 N.E.3d 337, 339 (Oh. Ct. App. 2022) (quoting Lincoln Tavern, Inc. v. Snader, 133 N.E.2d 606, 610 (Oh. 1956)). It is undisputed that Masters has entered an appearance, so even if W&L’s clients had not properly executed service of process upon Masters, personal jurisdiction is satisfied as if they had. In addition, the fact that W&L’s clients needed to serve Masters to begin with is only because Masters unreasonably withheld waiver of service. Both Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2) and the Court’s Case Management Order (Dkt. 232, pg. 10, ¶ 6(c)) obligate defendants to waive service absent good cause. Over a period of many months throughout 2018, Weitz & Luxenberg sought Masters’ waiver of service of summons. Masters stonewalled these efforts without cause and forced W&L to serve summons on Masters via process server. This refusal to waive service, Masters’ delay in raising the objection despite having actual notice via waiver request that it was named by W&L’s clients, and Masters’ dispute as to service address despite the affidavit clearly indicating that its representative accepted service each clearly indicate Masters’ intent to prejudice plaintiffs.
County of Berkeley, SC	1:19-op-45436	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	6/25/2019	
Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana	1:19-op-45438	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/20/2023	Tribes were not required to complete PFS.
Board of Commissioners of Fulton County (OH)	1:19-op-45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Prescription Supply	No			
Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, Ohio	1:19-op-45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Mylan	No			
Four County Board of Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services (OH)	1:19-op-45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Prescription Supply	No			
Town of Monroe, Connecticut	1:19-op-45441	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Hikma	No			

Town of Monroe, Connecticut	1:19-op-45441	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/16/2022	Mylan	No			
Johnson County, Kansas	1:19-op-45443	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/21/2022	Hikma	No			
Johnson County, Kansas	1:19-op-45443	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/21/2022	Mylan	No			
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45444	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45444	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45444	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
Avoyelles Parish Police Jury, Louisiana	1:19-op-45444	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45445	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45445	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45445	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Ouachita Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45446	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Ouachita Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45446	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	SHC Not Pursuing
Ouachita Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45446	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
Ouchita Parish Police Jury, Louisiana	1:19-op-45446	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
City of Laguna Beach, California	1:19-op-45447	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Robinson Calcagnie	No	2/13/2023	Mylan	No			<p>The City of Laguna Beach served its PFS to the PFS repository, and also directly served it upon Mylan's counsel. The City of Laguna Beach previously sent the PFS to the repository on 12/29/22, and again directly to Mylan's counsel on 2/13/23. Below is the email where Mylan's counsel was served the PFS directly.</p> <p>From: Darleen Perkins &lt;dperkins@robinsonfirm.com&gt;  Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 6:48 PM  To: rebecca.mandel@hoganlovells.com  Cc: Kevin Calcagnie &lt;kcalcagnie@robinsonfirm.com&gt;; Lila Razmara &lt;lrazmara@robinsonfirm.com&gt;; Tracy Hughes &lt;thughes@robinsonfirm.com&gt;  Subject: IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE LITIGATION (Mylan) - City of Laguna Beach, CA - MDL 2804; Case No. 1:19-op-45447 Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet</p> <p>IN RE: NATIONAL OPIATE LITIGATION  Case No. 1:17-MD-2804  City of Laguna Beach, California  Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet</p> <p>Dear Ms. Mandel:  Attached and served herewith, please find the City of Laguna Beach, California, Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet.</p> <p>Very truly yours,  Darleen Perkins, Paralegal  ROBINSON CALCAGNIE, INC.</p>
Sabine Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45448	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Sabine Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45448	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Sabine Parish Policy Jury	1:19-op-45448	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
City of Lake Charles	1:19-op-45449	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
City of Lake Charles	1:19-op-45449	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	

City of Lake Charles, Louisiana	1:19-op-45449	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Evangeline Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45450	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Evangeline Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45450	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Evangeline Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45450	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
Vernon Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45451	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Vernon Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45451	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Vernon Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45451	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
Morehouse Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45452	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
Morehouse Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45452	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
Morehouse Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45452	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
East Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45453	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
East Carroll Parish Police Jury, Louisiana	1:19-op-45453	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
East Carroll Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45453	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/12/2019	
East Carroll Police Jury	1:19-op-45453	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
West Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45454	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing
West Carroll Parish Police Jury	1:19-op-45454	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	9/11/2019	
West Carroll Parish Police Jury (LA)	1:19-op-45454	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/6/2019	
Chatham County (NC)	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton (NC)	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton, a municipal corporation, Chatham County, North Carolina, and all other similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
City of Canton, a municipal corporation, Chatham County, North Carolina, and all other similarly situated v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
City of Canton, NC	1:19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	10/3/2019	
Town of Arlington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45471	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Hikma	No			
Town of Arlington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45471	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Millington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45474	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Millington, Tennessee	1:19-op-45474	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Ponca City, OK	1:19-op-45495	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Ponca City, OK	1:19-op-45495	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Edmond, OK	1:19-op-45496	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Guthrie, OK	1:19-op-45497	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

City of Oklahoma City, OK	1:19-op-45498	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Inez (KY)	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
City of Inez, Kentucky	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Inez, KY	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/24/2023	
City of Inez, KY	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		
The City of Inez, Kentucky	1:19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
City of Lawton, OK	1:19-op-45500	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Lawton, OK	1:19-op-45500	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Rochester, MN	1:19-op-45501	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
County of Curry, OR	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	KVK-Tech	No			
County of Curry, Oregon	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Hikma	No			
County of Curry, Oregon	1:19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Mylan	No			
The City of Long Beach, Mississippi	1:19-op-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	10/29/2019 & 12/11/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	12/17/2019	Executed Waiver by Paul J. Cosgrove
Long Beach, MS	1:19-op-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	10/29/2019 & 12/11/2022	Winn-Dixie	No			
County of Northumberland v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45555	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/8/2019	As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug's submission. <i>Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843)</i>  •The Waivers of Service dated November 6, 2019 were filed on November 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45555 Doc Nos. 116 and 117). As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug's submission in Doc 4843.
County of Northumberland, PA	1:19-op-45555	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), "Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i>  Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.  •On August 26, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45052. The Affidavit of Service dated August 26, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45555 Doc No. 109).  •On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.
City of Paintsville, Kentucky	1:19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville, KY	1:19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		
The City of Paintsville, Kentucky	1:19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		
County of Calhoun (MI)	1:19-op-45560	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	1/2/2020	



H.W. “Billy” Hancock, in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Crisp County (GA)	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	9/16/2019	Waiver of service filed on docket 2/17/2023.
H.W. "Billy" Hancock in his Official Capacity as the Sheriff of Crisp County, Georgia	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	Amneal	No			
H.W. “Billy” Hancock, Sheriff of Crisp County, Georgia	1:19-op-45562	LCHB	No	3/6/2023	Mylan	No			
City of Sheridan, Colorado	1:19-op-45572	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
The City of Federal Heights, Colorado	1:19-op-45573	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Wright Township, PA	1:19-op-45574	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		<p>Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p><i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i></p> <p>Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiffs attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.</p> <p>•On August 29, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036. The Affidavit of Service dated August 29, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on September 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45574 Doc No. 91).</p> <p>•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.</p>
Wright Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45574	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/8/2019	<p>As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug’s submission.</p> <p><i>Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843)</i></p> <p>•The Waivers of Service dated November 6, 2019 were filed on November 8, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45574 Doc Nos. 114 and 115).</p> <p>As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug’s submission in Doc No. 4843.</p>
County of Yuma, Arizona	1:19-op-45575	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Pocatello, ID	1:19-op-45578	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
Kingston Borough , Pennsylvania	1:19-op-45585	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/16/2020	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Alamance County (NC)	1:19-op-45615	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/18/2020	
City of Nashville (GA)	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Nashville, GA	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver

City of Nashville, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Nashville, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Nashville, Georgia	1:19-op-45617	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Hikma; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Lakeland (GA)	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 14, 2023 to counsel for JM Smith; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Lakeland, GA	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Associated Pharmacies; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Lakeland, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
City of Lakeland, Georgia v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45618	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Amneal Pharmaceuticals; pending receipt of signed waiver
Boulder City, NV	1:19-op-45648	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Mesquite, NV	1:19-op-45649	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
County Commission of Payne County, OK	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
County Commission of Payne County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Payne County Commission, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45653	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Hanover Township, PA	1:19-op-45654	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		<p>Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p><i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i></p> <p>Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.</p> <p>•On September 17, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45040. The Affidavit of Service dated September 17, 2019 on file for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45654 Doc No. 91).</p> <p>•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.</p>
Hanover Township, Pennsylvania v. Purdue Pharma, LP., et al.	1:19-op-45654	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/12/2019	<p>As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug’s submission.</p> <p><i>Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843)</i></p> <p>•The Waivers of Service dated November 11, 2019 were filed on November 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45654 Doc No. 102 and 103).</p> <p>As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug’s submission in Doc No. 4843</p>
County of Lycoming v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45655	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	11/12/2019	<p>As demonstrated below, Plaintiffs have complied with service of process and have filed Waivers in the cases listed below. They were improperly included in Value Drug’s submission.</p> <p><i>Value Drug - listed as no service of process. (Doc No. 4843)</i></p> <p>•The Waivers of Service dated November 11, 2019 were filed on November 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45655 Doc Nos. 98 and 99).</p> <p>As such, this case should not have been listed in Value Drug’s submission in Doc No. 4843.</p>

									<p>Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time.</p> <p><i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i></p> <p>Per Masters submission, they claim that at times where the docket indicates Masters Pharma was served, they were no longer operating at the address where plaintiff attempted service (3600 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio 45036). As such, they claim that service was, therefore, improper and untimely.</p> <p>•On September 13, 2019, Masters was served at 3617 Pharma Way, Mason, Ohio, 45040. The Affidavit of Service dated September 13, 2019 for Masters Pharma was filed on October 12, 2019. (See Case 1:19-op-45655 Doc No. 92).</p> <p>•On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma.</p>
County of Lycoming, PA	1:19-op-45655	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
Claiborne County (TN)	1:19-op-45658	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	1/23/2020	
Claiborne County, TN	1:19-op-45658	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		TopRx	Yes	Yes	1/23/2020	
Fauquier County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45686	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Fauquier County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45686	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Fauquier County, Virginia v. Mallinckrodt LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45686	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

Board of Supervisors, Prince William County, Virginia	1:19-op-45687	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.



Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Northumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-45688	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Halifax County, Virginia	1:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Halifax County, Virginia	1:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Halifax County, Virginia	1:19-op-45692	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Lexington, Virginia	1:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Lexington, Virginia	1:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Lexington, Virginia	1:19-op-45693	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Rockbridge County, Virginia	1:19-op-45694	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>



Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Roanoke County, Virginia	1:19-op-45695	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Roanoke, Virginia	1:19-op-45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Roanoke, Virginia	1:19-op-45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Roanoke, Virginia	1:19-op-45696	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Salem, Virginia	1:19-op-45697	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Floyd County, Virginia	1:19-op-45698	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>



Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Alleghany County, Virginia	1:19-op-45700	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Franklin County, Virginia	1:19-op-45701	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Madison County, Virginia	1:19-op-45702	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Mustang, OK	1:19-op-45708	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Midwest City, OK	1:19-op-45709	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Pittsburg County, OK	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pittsburg County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pittsburg County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Pittsburg County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45711	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Actavis, LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45712	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Actavis, LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45712	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

City of Chesapeake, Virginia v. Actavis, LLC, et al.	1:19-op-45712	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
County of Walker (TX)	1:19-op-45713	Law Office of Mark A. Correro	No	N/A	JM Smith	No			
Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.



Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Accomack County, Virginia	1:19-op-45715	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Yukon, OK	1:19-op-45716	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Enid, OK	1:19-op-45717	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Enid, OK	1:19-op-45717	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Owasso, OK	1:19-op-45718	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Owasso, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45718	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

City of Bristol, Virginia	1:19-op-45719	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Louisa County, Virginia	1:19-op-45720	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Louisa County, Virginia	1:19-op-45720	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Louisa County, Virginia	1:19-op-45720	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of St. Albans (VT)	1:19-op-45721	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Burlington Drug	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
City of St. Albans (VT)	1:19-op-45721	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	

City of Hazelton, PA	1:19-op-45724	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Masters is claiming an issue with service of process, stating they were served at an improper address. To correct any deficiency, in good faith, our law firm has sent Waivers as set forth below. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant Masters Pharma by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <i>Masters Pharma - listed as no service of process/incorrect address. (Doc No. 4840)</i> •On February 13, 2023, an email was forwarded to William J. Aubel, Esq. requesting a Waiver of Service of Summons, along with a copy of the complaint, for Defendant Masters Pharma. *Please also note that the correct spelling is "Hazelton" not "Hazelton".
City of Hazelton, Pennsylvania	1:19-op-45724	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes	Pharmaceutical, Inc. listed City of Hazelton* as not serving a PFS on repository (as of 10/14/22). (Doc. No. 4847) •Per Judge Polster's order (Doc. #4664), the Government Plaintiff Fact Sheet and First Amended/ supplement thereto for the City of Hazelton, PA was emailed on October 12, 2022. Previous to that it was also filed on June 19, 2018. (See Case: 1:19-op-45724 - Doc No. 638-1). In response to the deficiency notice, plaintiff's counsel resent the PFS on 2/15/23. *Please also note that the correct	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	No			
City of Chubbuck, ID	1:19-op-45729	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Danville (VA)	1:19-op-45730	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
Pemiscot County (MO)	1:19-op-45733	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
Pemiscot County (MO)	1:19-op-45733	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/27/2020	
Pine County, MN	1:19-op-45738	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Austin, IN	1:19-op-45739	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00155. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received 02/22/23.
City of Austin, Indiana	1:19-op-45739	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00155. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received 02/22/23.
City of Madison, IN	1:19-op-45740	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00156. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/21/23, received 02/22/23.

City of Madison, Indiana	1:19-op-45740	Frank C Dudeneher, Jr., The Dudenhefer Law Firm LLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		The PFS was submitted on 06/13/20 and again on 10/13/22, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 19-op-00156. Out of abundance of caution, a further PFS was placed in the repository on 02/14/2023, bearing the incorrect civil action number of 1-md-2804. The correct civil action number is shown in Column B. Request for waiver sent by certified mail on 02/27/23.
City of Hoover, AL	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		From review of internal records, waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, Waiver of Service again sent on 03.06.2023 to counsel of record by email. Attorney Stewart Alvis indicated willingness to accept service on client's behalf following further rulings related to January 3, 2023 Order of Court. Also sent by certified mail to Company
City of Hoover, Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process		From review of internal records, waiver of service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, waiver of Service again sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by certified mail to Company. (Certified, tracking no. 7021197000143107897)
City of Hoover, Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	From review of internal records, waiver of service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, waiver of Service sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by certified mail to Company. (Certified, tracking no. 70211970000143107900), signed for by Heather Wheeler.
The City of Hoover, AL, a Municipal Corporation of the State of Alabama	1:19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	Yes	In Process		Following amendment of Hoover's complaint on November 26, 2019, Hoover attempted waiver of service by mail to listed counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, Hoover recognizes this waiver was either not sent or received, to wit: waiver of service is now being sought along with notice by certified mail.
City of Proctor, MN	1:19-op-45748	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Mandeville, LA	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
City of Mandeville, Louisiana	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	Waiver of service executed in October 2022. Filed executed waiver of service into record 2/13/2023. Defendant removed from Amended Notice.
Mandeville City, LA	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Mandeville City, Louisiana	1:19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Town of Pearl River, LA	1:19-op-45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Town of Pearl River, Louisiana	1:19-op-45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
Board of County Commissioners for Kiowa County, OK	1:19-op-45755	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Kiowa County, OK	1:19-op-45755	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Stephens County (OK)	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Stephens County, OK	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Stephens County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Stephens County, OK	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/21/2023	
Stephens County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45756	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Harper County, OK	1:19-op-45757	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Bingham County, Idaho	1:19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			SHC Not Pursuing



Bingham County, ID	1:19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	11/25/2019	
Bingham County, ID	1:19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Bingham County, Idaho	1:19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	No			
Board of County Commissioners of Johnston County, OK	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Johnston County, OK	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Johnston County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45765	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors	1:19-op-45766	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors	1:19-op-45766	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors	1:19-op-45766	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Slidell, LA	1:19-op-45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
City of Slidell, Louisiana	1:19-op-45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
Choctaw County, AL	1:19-op-45770	DeGaris Law	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	No			
Choctaw County, Alabama	1:19-op-45770	DeGaris Law	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
Washington Parish Government v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Not named as Defendant to suit.
Washington Parish Government, LA	1:19-op-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023. (Doc. No. 48)

Ada County, ID	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Ada County, ID	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Indivior added on short form. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Indivior after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Indivior declined waiver 3/16/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
Ada County, Idaho	1:19-op-45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Mylan added on short form. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No waiver received after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/13/2023.
City of Wichita, KS	1:19-op-45781	Hutton & Hutton; Bertram & Graf/Edgar Law Firm	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			The City of Wichita was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, The City of Witchita was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
City of Wichita, KS	1:19-op-45781	Hutton & Hutton; Bertram & Graf/Edgar Law Firm; Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			The City of Wichita was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, The City of Witchita was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
City of Prattville, Alabama	1:19-op-45783	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Prattville, Alabama	1:19-op-45783	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Orange Beach, Alabama	1:19-op-45784	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.

City of Orange Beach, Alabama	1:19-op-45784	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff’s counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff’s counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff’s counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
The Klamath Tribes	1:19-op-45786				Apotex	No			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
The Klamath Tribes	1:19-op-45786				Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Klamath Tribes, NJ	1:19-op-45786	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 649	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	12/10/2019	Proof of service at Dkt. 55.
Klamath Tribes, OR v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45786	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	Not required; Dkt. 638, Dkt. 644	SuperValu	No			
Decatur County, TN	1:19-op-45789	LCHB	No	3/15/2023	Morris & Dickson	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 3/14/2023. No response. Praeipce to obtain summons filed on 3/21/2023.
Decatur County, Tennessee	1:19-op-45789	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Amneal	No			
Chariton County, MO v. Purdue Pharm L.P. et al	1:19-op-45790	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/3/2020	
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel will file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel will file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
The Town of Bennington, Vermont v. Mallinckrodt PLC, et al.	1:19-op-45791	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On December 6, 2019, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. Subdivision counsel recently followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service but still has not received a response. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel will file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

City of Covington, Virginia	1:19-op-45799	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Covington, Virginia	1:19-op-45799	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Covington, Virginia	1:19-op-45799	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Board of County Commissioners for Dewey County, OK	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Dewey County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Dewey County, OK	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Dewey County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45801	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Jackson (MS)	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Henry Schein	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, Mississippi	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Hikma	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, MS	1:19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	KVK-Tech	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Twin Falls County, ID	1:19-op-45828	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Coon Rapids, MN	1:19-op-45835	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.



Loudoun County, Virginia	1:19-op-45842	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No		Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
City of Auburn v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Auburn, New York	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Auburn (New York)	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Henry Schein	No			
The City of Auburn (NY)	1:19-op-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
Lauderdale County, Alabama	1:19-op-45845	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Lauderdale County, Alabama	1:19-op-45845	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Greensville County, Virginia	1:19-op-45848	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

Culpeper County, Virginia	1:19-op-45849	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Charlotte County, Virginia	1:19-op-45851	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Charlotte County, Virginia	1:19-op-45851	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Charlotte County, Virginia	1:19-op-45851	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Ogdensburg, New York	1:19-op-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Ogdensburg, New York et al.	1:19-op-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Ogdensburg, New York	1:19-op-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Ogdensburg (NY)	1:19-op-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Ogdensburg v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Rochester, New York	1:19-op-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Rochester, New York	1:19-op-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Rochester, New York	1:19-op-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Rochester (NY)	1:19-op-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Rochester v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Portsmouth, Virginia	1:19-op-45856	Scott+Scott Attorneys at Law LLP	Yes		Hikma	Yes			
City of Saratoga Springs, New York	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
The City of Saratoga Springs, New York	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
City of Saratoga Springs, New York	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
The City of Saratoga Springs (NY)	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Saratoga Springs v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Saratoga Springs, NY	1:19-op-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Jenks, OK	1:19-op-45858	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

County of Kauai, political subdivision of the State of Hawaii, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, et al.	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
County of Kauai v. CVS Health Corporation, et al.	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
County of Kaua'i, a Political Subdivision of the State of Hawai'i, for themselves individually, and on behalf of all similarly situated persons, and on behalf of the general public, as a class (Hawaii)[1]	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Henry Schein	No			
County of Kaua'i, Hawaii	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
County of Kauai, Hawaii	1:19-op-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
The Fiscal Court of Casey County, Kentucky	1:19-op-45887	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Fiscal Court of Lewis County (KY)	1:19-op-45889	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Okaloosa County, Florida	1:19-op-45894	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
Okaloosa County, Florida	1:19-op-45894	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-op-45898	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.

City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-op-45898	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Fredericksburg, Virginia	1:19-op-45898	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
City of Sylacauga, Alabama	1:19-op-45900	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	<p>Plaintiff’s counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff’s counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff’s counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.</p>

City of Sylacauga, Alabama	1:19-op-45900	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Vancouver, WA	1:19-op-45908	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
Mesa County, CO	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	2/27/2023	Waiver filed 2/27/23. Waiver signed and received 4/3/2020.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa, Colorado	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa, Colorado	1:19-op-45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Township of Barnegat, NJ	1:19-op-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC	No	2/20/2023	American Sales Company, LLC	Yes	In Process		
Township of Barnegat, NJ	1:19-OP-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC	No	2/20/2023	TopRx	Yes	In Process		
Township of Barnegat, NJ Police Department	1:19-op-45925	The Wright Law Firm, LLC	No	2/20/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	In Process		
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-op-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-op-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Prince George County, Virginia	1:19-op-45929	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Pascagoula, MS	1:19-op-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	1/17/2020 & 12/11/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
The City of Pascagoula, Mississippi	1:19-op-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	1/17/2020 & 12/11/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Huntsville, Alabama	1:19-op-45947	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.



									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Huntsville, Alabama	1:19-op-45947	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	
City of Athens, Alabama	1:19-op-45953	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Athens, Alabama	1:19-op-45953	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
The Fiscal Court of Grant County (KY)	1:19-op-45961	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Grant County, Kentucky v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., et al.	1:19-op-45961	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Lincoln County, Washington v. Richard S. Sackler, et al.	1:19-op-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
Lincoln County, Washington v. Richard S. Sackler, et al.	1:19-op-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Homewood, Alabama	1:19-op-45973	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	
									Plaintiff's counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Homewood, Alabama	1:19-op-45973	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	Yes	In Process	In Process	
City of Greeley, CO	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Waiver filed 3/8/23. Waiver request originally sent 3/4/2020. After multiple follow-ups, waiver signed and returned 3/8/2023.
City of Greeley, Colorado	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Greeley, Colorado	1:19-op-45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Waiver request originally sent 4/7/2020. After multiple follow-ups, Indivior refused to sign waiver. Personal service perfected 3/10/2023.
City of Bainbridge Island, Washington	1:19-op-45981	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
County of Freestone, Texas	1:19-op-45985	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 10/24/2019.
Board of County Commissioners of Woods County, OK	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Woods County, OK	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

BOCC of Woods County, OK	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Woods County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45987	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Pottawatomie County, OK	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of Commissioners, OK	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Pottawatomie County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45988	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Kay County, OK	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Kay County, OK	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Kay County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Kay County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45989	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Major County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Major County, OK	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Major County, OK	1:19-op-45990	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Richmond County (VA)	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Warren County (VA)	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Westmoreland County (VA)	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Westmoreland County, Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC was not named as a Defendant in this case
Westmoreland County, Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
Westmoreland County, Virginia, et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Westmoreland County VA et al.	1:19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	4/2/2021	
West Pittston, PA	1:19-op-45997	Brindisi, Murad & Brindisi Pearlman	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		As demonstrated below, in a good faith attempt to correct the deficiency, a Waiver has been sent to KVK-Tech for signature. Per Case Management Order One (Doc No. 232, ¶6c, Service of Summons and Complaint), “Defendants are encouraged to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, shall grant requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” Since an Answer has not been served, Plaintiff submits there is no prejudice to Defendant KVK-Tech by requesting that the Waivers be signed at the present time. <div>KVK-Tech, Inc. – listed as no service of process. (Doc Nos. 4848 and 4876)</div> <div>•On February 10, 2023, a Waiver of Service of Summons along with a copy of the complaint was sent to Attorney Thomas E. Rice. Inc. – listed as no service of process. (Doc Nos. 4848 and 4876)</div>
City of Lynn Haven, Florida	1:19-op-46006	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No		Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff’s counsel believes his office submitted a service waiver to defense counsel at the time this case was originally filed. Counsel has confirmed that his legal assistant who was in charge of submitting waivers to defense submitted waivers to other defendants at or around the same time. Counsel cannot confirm with certainty that his legal assistant submitted a waiver to counsel for this defendant as the legal assistant left employment with the firm at the time of the COVID outbreak, and her internal electronic files are no longer accessible. Plaintiff’s counsel resubmitted the service waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff’s counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Lynn Haven, Florida	1:19-op-46006	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No		Mylan	No			
City of North St. Paul, MN	1:19-op-46066	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c

Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Mylan	No			Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, New Jersey	1:19-op-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	4/12/2019	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, NJ	1:19-op-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Indivior	No			Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Atlantic County, NJ	1:19-op-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	4/25/2018	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
City of New Port Richey (FL)	1:19-op-46073	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
City of Spokane, Washington	1:19-op-46092	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Buffalo (NY)	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Buffalo v. Purdue Pharma L..P, et al.	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Buffalo, New York	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Buffalo, New York	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Buffalo, New York	1:19-op-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Obion County (TN)	1:19-op-46115	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/23/2020	Waiver of service filed on docket 3/3/2023.
Obion County, Tennessee	1:19-op-46115	LCHB	No	3/14/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver sent 4/15/2020 but not returned. Defendants replied that they will not waive service. Praeipie to obtain summons filed on 3/20/2023.
City of Haleyville, AL	1:19-op-46118	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
The City of Ormond Beach (FL)	1:19-op-46121	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	12/15/2020	Winn Dixie's filing Notice filed on 1/30/23 (Doc 4846) has case # 1:19-op-45272 incorrectly listed for Ormond. Case # 1:19-op-45272 is Marion County FL. Ormond Beach case # is correct on the sheet
The City of Ormond Beach (FL)	1:19-op-46121	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
City of Brookhaven, MS	1:19-op-46143	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	4/14/2020	
City of Bethany, OK	1:19-op-46148	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Patrick County, Virginia	1:19-op-46149	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Shenandoah County, Virginia	1:19-op-46150	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Allegany County (New York)	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Henry Schein	No			
Allegany County v. Purdue Pharma LP, et al	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Hikma	No			
Allegany County, New York	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Allegany County, NY	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Allegany (NY)	1:19-op-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
The City of Waynesboro, Virginia	1:19-op-46152	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

Cumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-46153	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Cumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-46153	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Cumberland County, Virginia	1:19-op-46153	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision’s delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision’s delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Radford, Virginia	1:19-op-46154	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision’s delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Shawnee, OK	1:19-op-46155	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County, OK	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Caddo County, OK	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Caddo County, OK	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Caddo County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46156	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Amsterdam (NY)	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Amsterdam v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Amsterdam, New York	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Amsterdam, New York	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal	No			
The City of Amsterdam, New York	1:19-op-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	No			
The City of Poughkeepsie, New York, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23



City of Poughkeepsie v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Poughkeepsie, New York	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
City of Poughkeepsie, New York	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Mylan	No			
The City of Poughkeepsie (NY)	1:19-op-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
East Baton Rouge Parish Clerk Of Court Office, Louisiana	1:19-op-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Mylan	No			
Board of County Commissioners of Grady County, OK	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Grady County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Grady County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Grady County, OK	1:19-op-46167	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Clark County, NV	1:19-op-46168	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	No	Yes	N/A	Defendant error alleging untimely PFS upload.
Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County, OK	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County, Oklahoma	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Jefferson County, OK	1:19-op-46170	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Scott County, Missouri	1:19-op-46174	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Amneal	No			
Borough of Edwardsville, Pennsylvania v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.	1:19-op-46176	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/2/2020	
Forty Fort Borough, Pennsylvania v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation , et al.	1:19-op-46177	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/3/2020	
City of Marinette, WI	1:19-op-46181	Keller Postman LLC	No	2/21/2023	Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		Plaintiff intends to request Defendant waive service pursuant to CMO ¶6c
City of Pontiac, MI	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Pontiac, Michigan	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Pontiac, Michigan	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Pontiac, Michigan	1:19-op-46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Lawrence County, Kentucky	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Lawrence County, Kentucky	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Lawrence County, Kentucky	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Lawrence County, KY	1:19-op-46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.

City of Emporia, Virginia	1:19-op-46850	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested and received an executed waiver of service from the Defendant. Subdivision counsel filed the executed waiver with the court on February 24, 2023. Because the subdivision obtained an executed waiver of service from Defendant, Defendant has not been prejudiced by the subdivision's delay in filing the executed waiver and this case should not be dismissed.
McDonald County (MO)	1:20- op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		JM Smith	No			
City of Toledo, OH	1:2017op45005	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Sunflower County, MS	1:2018op45020	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
Washington County, MS	1:2018op45022	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
County of Lake, OH	1:2018op45032	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Claiborne County, MS	1:2018op45035	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	
City of Lansing, MI	1:2018op45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Lansing, MI	1:2018op45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Delta, MI	1:2018op45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Delta, MI	1:2018op45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Escanaba, MI	1:2018op45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Escanaba, MI	1:2018op45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Saginaw, MI	1:2018op45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Saginaw, MI	1:2018op45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Marquette, MI	1:2018op45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Marquette, MI	1:2018op45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Leelanau, MI	1:2018op45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Leelanau, MI	1:2018op45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
Candler County, GA	1:2018op45165	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Huerfano, CO	1:2018op45168	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
County of Huerfano, CO	1:2018op45168	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz Inc. on 2/17/23.
Marion County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45171	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Talladega County, AL	1:2018op45190	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praeipce for Issuance filed [Doc. 39] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 41].
Town of Butler, AL	1:2018op45216	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; No Response
Unified Government of Athens-Clarke County, GA	1:2018op45218	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Oconee County, GA	1:2018op45219	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).

									<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Marshall County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45230	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanis, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Jeff Davis County, GA	1:2018op45237	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Crisp County, GA	1:2018op45238	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Clay County, AL	1:2018op45248	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 38] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 40].
Sumter County, GA	1:2018op45250	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Oglethorpe County, GA	1:2018op45262	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Rome, GA, et al.*	1:2018op45282	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Irwin County, GA	1:2018op45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Irwin County, GA	1:2018op45283	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Cook County, GA	1:2018op45284	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Hall County, GA	1:2018op45286	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Madison County, GA	1:2018op45296	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Walton County GA	1:2018op45297	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Gautreaux (Sheriff of East Baton Rouge Parish), LA	1:2018op45325	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Decatur County, GA	1:2018op45334	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Gratiot, MI	1:2018op45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Gratiot, MI	1:2018op45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alcona, MI	1:2018op45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alcona, MI	1:2018op45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Arenac, MI	1:2018op45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Arenac, MI	1:2018op45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Dickinson, MI	1:2018op45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Dickinson, MI	1:2018op45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Iron Mountain, MI	1:2018op45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Iron Mountain, MI	1:2018op45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Ogemaw, MI	1:2018op45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Ogemaw, MI	1:2018op45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Isabella, MI	1:2018op45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.

County of Isabella, MI	1:2018op45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Shiawassee, MI	1:2018op45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Shiawassee, MI	1:2018op45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lenawee, MI	1:2018op45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lenawee, MI	1:2018op45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Sanilac, MI	1:2018op45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Sanilac, MI	1:2018op45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Antrim, MI	1:2018op45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Antrm, MI	1:2018op45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Benzie, MI	1:2018op45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Benzie, MI	1:2018op45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Osceola, MI	1:2018op45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Osceola, MI	1:2018op45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Oceana, MI	1:2018op45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Oceana, MI	1:2018op45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alger, MI	1:2018op45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alger, MI	1:2018op45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Luce, MI	1:2018op45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Luce, MI	1:2018op45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lake, MI	1:2018op45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Lake, MI	1:2018op45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
Banks County, GA	1:2018op45378	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Twiggs County, GA	1:2018op45379	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Elbert County, GA	1:2018op45381	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Bainbridge, GA	1:2018op45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Bainbridge, GA	1:2018op45383	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Bulloch County, GA	1:2018op45394	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:2018op45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Grand Rapids, MI	1:2018op45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
Unified Government of Macon Bibb County, GA	1:2018op45407	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Jones County, GA	1:2018op45424	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Warren County, GA	1:2018op45425	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pocahontas County Commission, WV	1:2018op45443	Skinner Law Firm			Sandoz/Novartis	No			Dismissed 02/28/2023
City of Tifton, GA	1:2018op45454	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Gainesville, GA	1:2018op45486	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Butts County, GA	1:2018op45490	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Dougherty County, GA	1:2018op45491	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).

City of Milledgeville, GA	1:2018op45495	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Jasper County, GA	1:2018op45504	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Ben Hill County, GA	1:2018op45505	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Wilcox, GA	1:2018op45506	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Lincoln County, GA	1:2018op45508	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	1/4/2023	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
McDuffie County, GA	1:2018op45509	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Hancock County, GA	1:2018op45535	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Habersham County, GA	1:2018op45559	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Taliaferro County, GA	1:2018op45562	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Washington County, GA	1:2018op45563	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Tattnall County, GA	1:2018op45574	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Toombs County, GA	1:2018op45576	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Macon County, GA	1:2018op45577	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Newton County, GA	1:2018op45578	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Schley County, GA	1:2018op45580	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
Jackson County, GA	1:2018op45581	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
County of Ballard, KY	1:2018op45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Harrisburg, IL	1:2018op45594	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Princeton, IL	1:2018op45599	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Worth County, GA	1:2018op45602	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Fitzgerald, GA	1:2018op45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Fitzgerald, GA	1:2018op45603	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Columbia County, GA	1:2018op45607	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Jackson County, AL, et al.	1:2018op45634	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulasas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Dooly County, GA	1:2018op45712	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).



Charlton County, GA	1:2018op45713	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Brantley County, GA	1:2018op45714	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Troup County, GA	1:2018op45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Johnson County, GA	1:2018op45716	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Camden County, GA	1:2018op45717	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Municipality of Yabucoa, PR*	1:2018op45731	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	5/20/2019	Summons were issued by the Clerk on or around May 16, 2019. Service of process on Sandoz, Inc.'s registered agent for service of process in New Jersey (state of incorporation/registered office) was effected on May 28, 2019. Excuted Proof of Service dated June 3, 2019 was filed into the docket on June 13, 2019 (1:18-op-45731; R. Doc. 20).  PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
Montgomery County, KS	1:2018op45780	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Bourbon County, KS	1:2018op45781	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Town of Munford, AL	1:2018op45785	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 40] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 42].
City of Lincoln, AL	1:2018op45786	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023	Despite diligent search, Plaintiff's counsel has been unable to locate filed Waiver of Service form for Sandoz, Inc. However, following the filing of the Defendant's deficiency notice, Plaintiff's counsel sent a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service to Sarah Thompson, attorney for Sandoz Inc. Ms. Thompson refused to sign Waiver of Service. Praecipe for Issuance filed [Doc. 43] and Defendant was personally served on 3/23/2023 [Doc. 45].
Nodaway County, MO	1:2018op45795	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Atchison County, MO	1:2018op45797	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Lafayette County, MO	1:2018op45840	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Harvey County, KS	1:2018op45848	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz Inc. on 2/17/23.
Harvey County, KS	1:2018op45848	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Ochs Law Firm	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Harford County, MD	1:2018op45853	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Novartis AG	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 27. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court's recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Novartis AG to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Novartis AG care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Novartis has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Novartis AG have been effectively cured.



									Plaintiffs filed their short form complaint on March 15, 2019, naming Novartis AG, Sandoz International GmbH, and Sandoz Inc. On April 11, 2019, they served the domestic entity – Sandoz Inc. – with the short form and operative complaint. See Dkt. No. 27. CMO 1 suspended service of international defendants. Following this Court’s recent orders on service, Plaintiffs sent a waiver request for Sandoz International GmbH to counsel of record, which counsel denied. Plaintiffs also served Sandoz International GmbH care of Sandoz Inc. on February 17, 2023. Thus, Sandoz has been on notice since April 11, 2019, at the latest, and has not been prejudiced. Any procedural service issues related to Sandoz International GmbH have been effectively cured.
Harford County, MD, et al	1:2018op45853	Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	
County of Montcalm, MI	1:2018op45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Montcalm, MI	1:2018op45865	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Houghton, MI	1:2018op45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Houghton, MI	1:2018op45866	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Tuscola, MI	1:2018op45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Tuscola, MI	1:2018op45870	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alpena, MI	1:2018op45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Alpena, MI	1:2018op45871	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Washtenaw, MI	1:2018op45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Washtenaw, MI	1:2018op45886	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Iron, MI	1:2018op45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Iron, MI	1:2018op45888	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Clinton, MI	1:2018op45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Clinton, MI	1:2018op45889	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of St. Clair, MI	1:2018op45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of St. Clair, MI	1:2018op45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Charlevoix, MI	1:2018op45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Charlevoix, MI	1:2018op45897	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of East Lansing, MI	1:2018op45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of East Lansing, MI	1:2018op45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Hudson, NJ	1:2018op45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Bland County, VA	1:2018op46065	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/10/2019 and on 2/17/2023.
Grayson County, VA	1:2018op46069	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and on 2/17/2023.
Wythe County, VA	1:2018op46072	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and on 2/17/2023.
Tazewell County, VA	1:2018op46167	Wagstaff & Cartmell	Yes		Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	In Process		Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver sent to Lori Cohen, Greenberg Traurig, on 6/14/2019 and on 2/17/2023.
Livingston County, MO	1:2018op46168	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
County of Ingham, MI	1:2018op46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Ingham, MI	1:2018op46178	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
City of Overland Park, KS	1:2018op46287	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Henry County, GA	1:2018op46310	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23

Board of County Commissioners of Pawnee County, OK	1:2018op46320	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/19/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Board of County Commissioners of Delaware County, OK	1:2018op46321	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Board of County Commissioners of Osage County, OK	1:2018op46322	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Grady County, GA*	1:2018op46338	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Sandoz Inc.; pending receipt of signed waiver
County of Kent, MI	1:2019op45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
County of Kent, MI	1:2019op45000	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No		Served Sandoz, Inc.
Police Jury of the Parish of Pointe Coupee, LA	1:2019op45012	Gainsburgh, Benjamin, David, Meunier & Warshauer, LLC	No	1/30/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Unified Government of Wyandotte County, KS	1:2019op45015	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz International GmbH	Yes	No	N/A	A request for waiver of service pursuant to Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was circulated to Sandoz International GmbH on 2/17/23.
Atkinson County, GA	1:2019op45118	Conley Griggs Partin LLP	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		emailed Waiver of Service of Summons on February 15, 2023 to counsel for Sandoz Inc.; pending receipt of signed Waiver
Blount County, TN	1:2019op45132	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
City of Rainsville, AL, et al.	1:2019op45135	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
Wilkes County, GA	1:2019op45171	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Towns County, GA	1:2019op45172	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
McIntosh County, GA	1:2019op45173	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Cherokee County, GA	1:2019op45174	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Glascocock County, GA	1:2019op45175	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pulaski County, GA	1:2019op45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Rabun County, GA	1:2019op45177	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Effingham County, GA	1:2019op45178	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Pike County, GA	1:2019op45179	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Early County, GA	1:2019op45180	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Seminole County, GA	1:2019op45181	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Clay County, GA	1:2019op45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).

Clay County, GA	1:2019op45194	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Stephens County, GA	1:2019op45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Long County, GA	1:2019op45196	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Clinch County, GA	1:2019op45197	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Clinch County, GA	1:2019op45197	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	Yes	No		Sandoz, Inc. has not alleged a service defect. However, Novartis AG has alleged a service defect. Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Screven County, GA	1:2019op45198	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Springfield, GA	1:2019op45199	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Liberty County, GA	1:2019op45200	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Jefferson County, GA	1:2019op45201	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Randolph County, GA	1:2019op45202	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Greene County, GA	1:2019op45203	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Wayne County, GA	1:2019op45204	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Burke County, GA	1:2019op45207	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Spalding County, GA	1:2019op45208	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Emanuel County, GA	1:2019op45209	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Dawson County, GA	1:2019op45210	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Lumpkin County, GA	1:2019op45211	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Memphis, TN	1:2019op45220	O'Leary, Shelton, Corrigan, Peterson, Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Emailed Waiver request to Defense Counsel (cohenl@gtlaw.com) on 10/11/19 b but no reply was received from Defendant. Alias Summons served on 2/17/23
Seminole County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:2019op45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Montgomery County, GA	1:2019op45292	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/11/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Fayette County, GA	1:2019op45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
City of Prestonsburg, KY	1:2019op45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
Davis (Sheriff of Bibb County), GA	1:2019op45360	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	n/a	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, OH	1:2019op45440	Zoll & Kranz LLC	No	3/22/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45445	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
Ouachita Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45446	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
Sabine Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45448	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
City of Lake Charles, LA	1:2019op45449	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
Evangeline Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45450	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
Vernon Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45451	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/20/2019	
Morehouse Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45452	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	

East Carroll Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45453	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
West Carroll Parish Police Jury, LA	1:2019op45454	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	6/13/2019	
City of Inez, KY	1:2019op45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		
County of Curry, OR	1:2019op45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Documents are out for service with the Clerk of the Court. Waiver of service was sent on 9/17/2019 to counsel of record, Lori G. Cohen, but no response was ever received. Service by Clerk. Summons and Complaint addressed to Sandoz Inc. placed in U.S. Mail. Type of service: Certified Mail. Receipt # 9314 7699 0430 0104 6169 68. (F,ML) (Entered: 03/03/2023) - Docket No. 42
City of Hoover, AL	1:2019op45746	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	From review of internal records, waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record. Upon notice of the deficiency, waiver of service sent on 03.08.2023 to counsel of record by email and by United States Postal Service (certified, tracking no. 70211970000143107917) to Company, signed for by Roger Bousquet on March 14, 2023.
Mandeville City, LA	1:2019op45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Town of Pearl River, LA	1:2019op45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Bingham County, ID	1:2019op45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	11/7/2019	
City of Slidell, LA	1:2019op45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Washington Parish Government, LA	1:2019op45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Ada County, ID	1:2019op45775	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
The City of Auburn, NY	1:2019op45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
The City of Ogdensburg, NY	1:2019op45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The City of Rochester, NY	1:2019op45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Kauai, HI	1:2019op45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
The Fiscal Court of Casey County, KY	1:2019op45887	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Lewis County, KY	1:2019op45889	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Gallatin County, KY	1:2019op45891	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Mesa, CO	1:2019op45923	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
Lincoln County, WA	1:2019op45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
City of Greeley, CO	1:2019op45977	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/17/23. Sandoz added on short form. No waiver filed on the docket by Sandoz per CTO 1. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No response received from Sandoz after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023. Letter received from Sandoz on 3/17/23 declining to sign waiver and claiming Sandoz incorrectly named as there is no comma in Sandoz Inc.
Atlantic County, NJ	1:2019op46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
City of Buffalo, NY	1:2019op46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Amsterdam, NY	1:2019op46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Poughkeepsie, NY	1:2019op46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Pontiac, MI	1:2019op46183	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			



Lawrence County, KY	1:2019op46184	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Hawaii, HI	1:2020op45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Fiscal Court of Monroe County, KY	1:2020op45016	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
The City of Calais, ME	1:2020op45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Evans County, GA	1:2020op45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
Appling County, GA	1:2020op45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Novartis AG	Yes	No		Plaintiff did not serve Novartis AG because CMO 1, ¶ 6.d. states that "[s]ervice on a foreign corporation is suspended until further order of the Court." (Doc. 232).
The City of Sedalia, Pettis County, MO	1:2020op45152	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Sandoz Inc. on 2/17/23.
Leland Falcon (Sheriff of Assumption Parish), LA	1:2020op45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
St. Bernard Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:2021op45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
St. James Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. James Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Town of Lutcher, LA	1:2021op45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board, LA	1:2021op45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/17/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/16/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/17/2023.
Hancock County Board of Education, TN, et al.	1:2022op45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Board of Education, WV, et al.	1:2022op45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Clinton County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45130-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Pike County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45131-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Ray County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45132-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Lawrence County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45134-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Henry County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45135-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Dade County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45224-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
McDonald County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45225-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Catawba Nation v. Endo Health Solutions, Inc. et al.	1:20-op- 45234-DAP	Fields Han Cunniff PLLC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	In Process		Plaintiff's counsel sent waiver request to Pharmacy Buying Association on 2/21/2023, but did not receive a waiver of service within 30 days. Plaintiff's counsel will serve process via process server.
White Mountain Apache Nation et al v. Endo Health Solutions, Inc. et al	1:20-op- 45243-DAP	Fields Han Cunniff PLLC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	In Process		Plaintiff's counsel sent waiver request to Pharmacy Buying Association on 2/21/2023, but did not receive a waiver of service within 30 days. Plaintiff's counsel will serve process via process server.

Adair Co., MO v. Allergan PLC, et al	1:20-op- 45297-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Andrew Co., MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45298-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
DeKalb County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:20-op- 45299-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO v. Allergan PLC, et al	1:20-op- 45300-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
BOCC of Love County, OK	1:20-op-45000	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Atoka County Board of Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Atoka County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Atoka County, OK	1:20-op-45001	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Haskell County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Haskell County, OK	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Haskell County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Haskell County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45002	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Latimer County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Latimer County, OK	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Latimer County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45003	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
City of Seminole, OK	1:20-op-45004	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Seminole, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45004	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	No			
Village of Pleasant Prairie, WI	1:20-op-45010	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech		Yes	5/8/2020	
County of Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
County of Hawaii, Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
County of Hawaii, Hawaii	1:20-op-45014	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			
Fiscal Court of Monroe County, Kentucky	1:20-op-45016	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Borough of Exeter v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.	1:20-op-45019	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	4/2/2020	
BOCC of Cimarron County, OK	1:20-op-45021	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Anadarko, OK	1:20-op-45022	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Anadarko, OK	1:20-op-45022	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	No			
City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Amneal	No			
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	1:20-op-45044	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	No			



									Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision’s ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant’s actual notice of this lawsuit, constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where “a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and ‘presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.’” In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride & Naloxone) Antitrust Litig., 64 F. Supp. 3d 665, 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (collecting cases and ordering Rule 4(m) extension in MDL despite “no attempt to establish good cause for failure to serve”). This lack of prejudice to Defendants contrasts sharply with the great potential for prejudice to the listed subdivision. While subdivision counsel does not concede that any statute of limitations has run for any claims, there is little doubt that Defendants will assert that some of subdivisions’ claims are time-barred in the listed case. This fact is “a factor favoring the plaintiff in a Rule 4(m) analysis.” AIG Managed Mkt. Neutral Fund v. Askin Cap. Mgmt., L.P., 197 F.R.D. 104, 109 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (granting Rule 4(m) time extension in consolidated actions because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed subdivision additional time for service.
Amherst County, VA	1:20-op-45046	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Calais, Maine	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Calais, Maine	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Calais, ME	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
The City of Calais, Maine	1:20-op-45051	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Carol County, Michigan	1:20-op-45052-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes			Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
County of Angelina, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45053	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Angelina, Texas v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45053	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Angelina, Texas v	1:20-op-45053	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal	No			
County of Alameda, California; City of Costa Mesa, California; City of Anaheim, California; City of Santa Ana, California; City of San Clemente, California; City of Encinitas, California; City of La Habra, California; City of La Mesa, California; City of Oxnard, California; City of Placentia, California	1:20-op-45055	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	5/5/2020 and reserved on 2/12/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	
County of Alameda, California; City of Costa Mesa, California; City of Anaheim, California; City of Santa Ana, California; City of San Clemente, California; City of Encinitas, California; City of La Habra, California; City of La Mesa, California; City of Oxnard, California; City of Placentia, California	1:20-op-45055	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	5/5/2020 and reserved on 2/12/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/27/2023	

BOCC of Oklahoma County, OK	1:20-op-45056	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County, OK	1:20-op-45057	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Oklahoma County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45057	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Logan County, OK	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Logan County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Logan County, OK	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Logan County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45058	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
The Fiscal Court of Adair County (KY)	1:20-op-45059	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	12/30/2020	
The Fiscal Court of Adair County, on Behalf of Adair County, Kentucky	1:20-op-45059	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	03/08/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Texas County, OK	1:20-op-45061	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Texas County, OK	1:20-op-45061	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Henderson et al., KY	1:20-op-45062	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Henderson, Kentucky	1:20-op-45062	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	9/23/2019	
City of Henderson, Kentucky	1:20-op-45062	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	Mylan	No			
City of Henderson, Kentucky, et al.	1:20-op-45062	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	Amneal	No			
Hardin County Fiscal Court et al., KY	1:20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes		KVK-Tech	No			
Hardin County Fiscal Court, Kentucky, et al.	1:20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	9/23/2019	
Hardin County Fiscal Court, Kentucky, et al.	1:20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes		Amneal	No			
Hardin County Fiscal Court, Kentucky	1:20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes		Mylan	No			

									Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision’s ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant’s actual notice of this lawsuit, constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where “a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and ‘presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.’” In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride & Naloxone) Antitrust Litig., 64 F. Supp. 3d 665, 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (collecting cases and ordering Rule 4(m) extension in MDL despite “no attempt to establish good cause for failure to serve”). This lack of prejudice to Defendants contrasts sharply with the great potential for prejudice to the listed subdivision. While subdivision counsel does not concede that any statute of limitations has run for any claims, there is little doubt that Defendants will assert that some of subdivisions’ claims are time-barred in the listed case. This fact is “a factor favoring the plaintiff in a Rule 4(m) analysis.” AIG Managed Mkt. Neutral Fund v. Askin Cap. Mgmt., L.P., 197 F.R.D. 104, 109 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (granting Rule 4(m) time extension in consolidated actions because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed subdivision additional time for service.
Botetourt County, VA	1:20-op-45064	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		
Board of County Commissioners of LeFlore County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of LeFlore County, OK	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
LeFlore County Board of Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45067	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
Bertucci, as the Coroner of St. Bernard Parish, and St. Bernard Parish Coroner's Office	1:20-OP-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		TopRx	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Plaintiff had also received multiple phone calls from counsel for Defendant requesting to discuss voluntary dismissal for substantive reasons, causing Plaintiff to believe Defendant had either been served or accepted service. Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
Bertucci, Dr. Bryan for St. Bernard Parish Coroner's Office, Louisiana	1:20-op-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		Hikma	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
Bryan Bertucci, Coroner; St. Bernard Parish Coroner, Louisiana	1:20-op-45077	Porteous, Hainkel & Johnson,	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		This Defendant was named in Plaintiff's Short Form Amended Complaint in which electronic notice was provided to all newly named Defendants therein. Prior to Defendant's recent submission that included Plaintiff on a list of those with service issues, Plaintiff was unaware there was an alleged service defect Due to this, perfection of service is being requested/is in process.
Evans County (GA)	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/23/2020	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 3/23/20. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/3/23.
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Hikma	No			
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Mylan	No			
Evans County, Georgia	1:20-op-45080	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Amneal	No			
Appling County (GA)	1:20-op-45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	3/20/2020	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 03/20/20. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 02/01/23.
Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Hikma	No			

Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Mylan	No			
Appling County, Georgia	1:20-op-45081	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	Amneal	No			
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Polk County, MO	1:20-op-45082	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Polk County, Missouri	1:20-op-45082-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Sugar Notch Borough, Pennsylvania v. AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al.	1:20-op-45090	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Value Drug	Yes	Yes	03/06/2023	
Acadia-St. Landry Hospital Service District	1:20-op-45097	Neblett, Beard & Arsenaault	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Hospital Service District No. 1 of the Parish of Avoyelles, State of Louisiana	1:20-op-45098	Neblett, Beard & Arsenaault	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hosptials, Third-Party-Payors) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, Kansas	1:20-op-45099	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Bertram & Graf The Popham Law Firm Bryan, Lykins & Hejtmanek			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes		N/A	Plaintiff is a Tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to Tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
County of Madison, Mississippi	1:20-op-45106	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023	Hikma	No			
County of Madison, Mississippi	1:20-op-45106	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/2/2023	Mylan	No			
Patty Carol Leysen	1:20-op-45107	Pinto Coates Kyre & Bowers, PLLC			Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes			THIS IS AN INDIVIDUAL CLAIMANT, NOT A SUBDIVISION OR A GOVERNMENT ENTITY
Rapides Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45111	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	6/5/2020	
City of Kirkland, Washington	1:20-op-45121	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/20/23. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. not a named defendant. West-Ward Pharmaceutical Corp is a named defendant. Waiver request originally sent to West-Ward on 1/3/2020. No response received after multiple follow-ups. Personal service perfected 3/15/2023.
City of Kirkland, Washington	1:20-op-45121	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Declaration of Service re personal service filed 3/14/23. Mylan added on short form. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. No waiver received after multiple follow-up requests. Personal service perfected 3/13/2023.
Phillip Terrell, Rapides Parish District Attorney	1:20-op-45123	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes		10/16/2020	
Phillip Terrell, Rapides Parish District Attorney	1:20-op-45123	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	Yes	Yes	6/8/2020	
City of Stewart, FL	1:20-op-45124-DAP	The Law Office of Travis V	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	In Process		
Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County, OK	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Jackson County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
BOCC of Jackson County, OK	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Jackson County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45126	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Lincoln County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45128	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/10/2023	

BOCC of Noble County, OK	1:20-op-45129	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Noble County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45129	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Clinton County, MO	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Clinton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45130-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Pike County, MO	1:20-op-45131	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Pike County, Missouri	1:20-op-45131-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Ray County, Missouri	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Ray County, Missouri	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Ray County, MO	1:20-op-45132	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Vernon County, MO	1:20-op-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Vernon County, Missouri	1:20-op-45133-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Lawrence County, MO	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Lawrence County, Missouri	1:20-op-45134-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Henry County, MO	1:20-op-45135	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Henry County, Missouri	1:20-op-45135-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
BOCC of Woodward County, OK	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Woodward County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Woodward County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Woodward County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	

Woodward County Board of County Commissioners, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45141	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Fullerton, California; City of Westminster, California	1:20-op-45143	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	6/30/2020 and reserved 2/12/23	Mylan	No			Fullerton fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20; Westminster fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20 and again on 2/12/23.
City of Fullerton, California; City of Westminster, California	1:20-op-45143	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	6/30/2020 and reserved 2/12/23	Mylan	No			Fullerton fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20; Westminster fact sheet submitted on 6/30/20 and again on 2/12/23.
Board of County Commissioners of Beckham County, OK	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Beckham County, OK v. Cephalon, Inc. et al	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Beckham County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Beckham County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45146	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Coal County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Coal County, OK	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Coal County Board of County Commissioners, OK	1:20-op-45149	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
The Board of County Commissioners for Allen County, KS & Jerry Hathaway, Allen County Attorney	1:20-op-45151	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	KVK-Tech	No			Allen County, KS was initially included on KVK-Tech's 1/30/23 deficiency list. However, Allen County was removed from KVK-Tech's amended deficiency list filed on 2/6/23.
The Board of County Commissioners for Allen County, Kansas and Jerry Hathaway, Allen County Attorney	1:20-op-45151	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
The City of Sedalia, Pettis County, Missouri	1:20-op-45152	Skikos Crawford Skikos & Joseph Wagstaff & Cartmell Bertram & Graf	Yes	N/A	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	N/A	Service by co-counsel was previously attempted by sending a request for waiver of service. The waiver of service was not executed and returned. A new request for waiver of service pursuant to FRCP Rule 4(d) and CMO-1 was sent to Amneal on 2/17/23.
Cayuga Nation	1:20-op-45153				American Sales Company, LLC	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Cayuga Nation v. Cephalon, Inc.,	1:20-op-45153				Value Drug	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Board of County Commissioners of Muskogee County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45155	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	2/13/2023	
Board of Supervisors for Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	1:20-op-45157	Irpino Avin Hawkins	No		Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			This client is not a political subdivision and therefore not subject to submission of a PFS. This plaintiff should not be included on this spreadsheet and is not subject to compliance/issues raised in the Order at Dkt. 4801.
City of Muskogee, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45162	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Muskogee, OK	1:20-op-45162	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	



City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No	2/6/2023	Henry Schein	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No	2/6/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
City of Morganfield, Kentucky	1:20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No	2/6/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC			Henry Schein	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC			Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
Stone County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45168	Frazer PLC			Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barton County, MO	1:20-op-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barton County, Missouri	1:20-op-45171-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Mecklenburg County, VA	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. Even if the Court does not find good cause for subdivision counsel’s efforts, the Court should provide more time for service pursuant to Rule 4(m) because there is no prejudice to Defendants and dismissal without prejudice would prejudice subdivisions. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where “a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and ‘presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.’” In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride & Naloxone) Antitrust Litig., 64 F. Supp. 3d 665, 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (collecting cases and ordering Rule 4(m) extension in MDL despite “no attempt to establish good cause for failure to serve”). This lack of prejudice to Defendants contrasts sharply with the great potential for prejudice to the listed subdivisions. While subdivision counsel does not concede that any statute of limitations has run for any claims, there is little doubt that Defendants will assert that some of subdivisions’ claims are time-barred in the listed cases. This fact is “a factor favoring the plaintiff in a Rule 4(m) analysis.” AIG Managed Mkt. Neutral Fund v. Askin Cap. Mgmt., L.P., 197 F.R.D. 104, 109 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (granting Rule 4(m) time extension in consolidated actions because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed subdivisions additional time for service.

Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process	<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties’ agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

									On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Mecklenburg County, Virginia	1:20-op-45174	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		
BOCC of Comanche County, OK	1:20-op-45180	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Custer County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45182	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Custer County, OK	1:20-op-45182	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Roger Mills County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45183	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Roger Mills County, OK	1:20-op-45183	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Bedford County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45184	Morgan & Morgan Complex Litigation Group	No	3/14/2022	Value Drug	Yes	No	TBD	A copy of the Complaint was mailed via certified mail and delivered on 3/9/20 per the USPS return in my possession. The only basis for Value Drug's continued assertion that service hasn't been perfected is because the complaint was not served via the Blair County Sheriff's department. However, Value Drug did recieve the Complaint on 3/9/202 and I have proof of delivery.
Bedford County, Pennsylvania	1:20-op-45184	Morgan & Morgan Complex Litigation Group	No	3/14/2022	Amneal	No	Yes		
Board of County Commissioners of Tillman County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45185	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC Tillman County, OK	1:20-op-45185	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Hinds County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45190	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Hinds County, MS	1:20-op-45190	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish Police Jury	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish, Louisiana	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Assumption Parish Police Jury, LA	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Assumption Parish Police Jury, LA	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	No			

Assumption Parish Police Jury, Louisiana	1:20-op-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Hikma	No			
Leland Falcon, Assumption Parish Sheriff	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of Assumption Parish, Louisiana	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of Assumption Parish, Louisiana in his capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Assumption Parish Sheriff's Office	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of Assumption Parish, Louisiana in his capacity as Officer Ex Officio of the Assumption Parish Sheriff's Office	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Leland Falcon, Louisiana	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Hikma	No			
Leland Falcon, Sheriff of Assumption Parish, in his capacity as officer ex officio of the Assumption Parish Sheriff's Office, LA	1:20-op-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	No			
West Ascension Parish Hospital Service District	1:20-op-45207	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
City of Opelika, Alabama	1:20-op-45208	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Opelika, Alabama; City of Spanish Fort, Alabama; City of Centreville, Alabama; City of Slocomb, Alabama; Town of West Blocton, Alabama	1:20-op-45208	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish Government	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish Government, LA	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
Lafourche Parish Government, LA	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Indivior	No			
Lafourche Parish Government, Louisiana	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Hikma	No			
LaFourche Parish, Louisiana	1:20-op-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Mylan	No			
Tunica County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45213	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Tunica County, MS	1:20-op-45213	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			
Bolivar County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Hikma	No			
Bolivar County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Mylan	No			
Bolivar County, MS	1:20-op-45214	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Marion, Illinois, a home unit v. Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., et al.	1:20-op-45215	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
The City of Orlando, Florida	1:20-op-45223	Morgan & Morgan	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Plaintiff decided not to perfect service for defendant Amneal.
The City of Orlando, Florida	1:20-op-45223	Morgan & Morgan	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No		Plaintiff decided not to perfect service for defendant Amneal.

Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Dade County, MO	1:20-op-45224	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Dade County, Missouri	1:20-op-45224-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
McDonald County, MO	1:20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
McDonald County, Missouri	1:20-op-45225-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Shawnee County, Kansas	1:20-op-45226	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Shawnee County, Kansas,	1:20-op-45226-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Daphne, Alabama	1:20-op-45227	Mantipty & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Henry Schein	No			
City of Daphne, Alabama	1:20-op-45227	Mantipty & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Amneal	No			
Town of Cottage City, Maryland	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/31/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/31/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Town of Cottage City, Forest Heights, North Brentwood, Upper Marlboro	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Giant Food Stores, LLC	Yes	Yes	2/20/2023	
Town of Cottage City, Maryland, et al.	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Town of Cottage City, MD, et al.	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Town of Cottage City, Town of Forest Heights, Town of North Brentwood, and Town of Upper Marlboro, MD	1:20-op-45235	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Town of Cottage City, The Town of Forest Heights, Town of North Brentwood, and The Town of Upper Marlboro, MD	1:20-op-45235-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes			Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Scott County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023	Hikma	No			
Scott County, Mississippi	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023	Mylan	No			
Scott County, MS	1:20-op-45238	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/5/2023	Indivior	No			
City of Clearlake, California, et al.	1:20-op-45251	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
City of El Reno, OK	1:20-op-45252	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of El Reno, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45252	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Dublin, California; City of Murietta, California	1:20-op-45255	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	1/4/21 and reserved on 2/12/23	Mylan	Yes	Yes	03/27/2023	
City of Dublin, California; City of Murietta, California	1:20-op-45255	Robins Kaplan LLP	Yes	1/4/21 and reserved on 2/12/23	Mylan	Yes	Yes	03/27/2023	
BOCC of Greer County, OK	1:20-op-45256	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Board of County Commissioners of Choctaw County, OK	1:20-op-45257	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
BOCC of Hughes County, OK	1:20-op-45258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	

BOCC of McCurtain County, OK	1:20-op-45259	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Town of Poughkeepsie, NY	1:20-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/22/2023	waiver also sent 2/17/23
Town of Poughkeepsie, New York	1:20-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Town of Poughkeepsie, New York	1:20-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Mylan	No			
Town of Poughkeepsie, NY	1:20-op-45260	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Leesburg, Alabama	1:20-op-45261	DeGaris Law	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Leesburg, Alabama; City of Jacksonville, Alabama; City of Rainbow City, Alabama; City of Ashville, Alabama; City of Springville, Alabama; City of Moody, Alabama; City of Ragland, Alabama; City of Thomasville, Alabama	1:20-op-45261	DeGaris Law	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
Ford County Kansas	1:20-op-45263-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	No	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Fultondale, Alabama, et al.	1:20-op-45265	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Amneal	No			
City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Graysville, Alabama; City of Centre, Alabama; Town of Cedar Bluff, Alabama; City of Dadeville, Alabama; Town of Camp Hill, Alabama; Town of Oakman, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; and Town of Gilberttown, Alabama	1:20-op-45265	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Henry Schein	No			
City of Fultondale, Alabama; City of Graysville, Alabama; City of Centre, Alabama; Town of Cedar Bluff, Alabama; City of Dadeville, Alabama; Town of Camp Hill, Alabama; Town of Oakman, Alabama; City of Attalla, Alabama; and Town of Gilberttown, Alabama	1:20-op-45265	Frazer PLC	Yes	2/17/23 (Gilberttown)	Henry Schein	No			
Natchitoches Parish Council	1:20-op-45270	Laborde Earles Law Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/1/2021	Affidavit of Service with Certified Mail Receipt and Tracking filed 3/24/23
Natchitoches Parish Council (LA)	1:20-op-45270	Laborde Earles Law Firm	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	No		
Northport, AL	1:20-op-45272	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Winn-Dixie	No			
City of Auburn, Alabama	1:20-op-45282	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2021	
City of Auburn. AL	1:20-op-45282	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	03/23/2021	
Lower Makefed Township v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.	1:20-op-45284	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Value Drug	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service



Lower Makefield Township	1:20-op-45284	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Amneal	No			
Lower Makefield Township PA	1:20-op-45284	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	KVK-Tech	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
City of Foley, Alabama	1:20-op-45287	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Foley, Alabama	1:20-op-45287	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>
Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		<p>On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel's Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties' agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel's email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties' agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation "to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1)." (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.</p>

Dinwiddie County, Virginia	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		On January 29, 2019, Defendant and subdivision counsel agreed to terms of service providing that Defendant would accept service via email in subdivision counsel’s Virginia cases, including those cases that had not yet been served or filed. The parties further agreed that service would be effective as of the date defendant sent a reply email acknowledging receipt of service, except that if defendant did not reply within ten business days, service would be deemed effective as of the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel sent Defendant the complaint in this case, in accordance with the parties' agreement. Defendant did not respond to that email, so, under the parties’ agreement, service was effective the tenth business day following subdivision counsel’s email. Now, years later, Defendant claims for the first time that it was not properly served, failing to mention that it was served according to the parties’ agreement. This alone constitutes good cause to either find that Defendant has been properly served or at least grant subdivision counsel additional time to perfect service. Further, out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel also sent Defendant a waiver of service on along with the complaint. However, Defendant did not return an executed the waiver of service form. After Defendant unexpectedly disputed service, subdivision counsel followed up with Defendant and again requested a waiver of service, but Defendant has not responded. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant had an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Defendant has not demonstrated good cause for its failure to return executed waivers of service. Subdivision counsel plans to file the executed waiver promptly upon receipt from Defendant.
Dinwiddie County, VA	1:20-op-45291	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Indivior	Yes	In Process		Subdivision counsel continues to search for relevant records documenting service. In the meantime, and out of an abundance of caution, subdivision counsel has recently requested waivers of service for this case. As this court has made clear in its Case Management Order, Defendant has an obligation “to avoid unnecessary expenses associated with serving the summons and, absent good cause, . . . [should have] grant[ed] requests to waive service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(1).” (Case Management Order No. 1 ¶ 6c, ECF No. 232). Subdivision counsel has also filed a praecipe for a summons with the court and will effect service as soon as the court returns a signed summons. The subdivision’s ongoing efforts to perfect service, combined with Defendant’s actual notice of this lawsuit, constitute good cause under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for the subdivision to perfect service. Even if the Court does not find good cause here, the Court should exercise its discretion under Rule 4(m) to provide more time for service because there is no prejudice to Defendants, while dismissal without prejudice would prejudice the subdivision. Courts have ordered extensions of time instead of dismissal in similar circumstances where “a defendant is already before the court in a consolidated action and ‘presumably the only result of a dismissal would be that the [ ] Plaintiffs would refile their complaint, resulting in a waste of judicial resources.’” In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride & Naloxone) Antitrust Litig., 64 F. Supp. 3d 665, 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (collecting cases and ordering Rule 4(m) extension in MDL despite “no attempt to establish good cause for failure to serve”). This lack of prejudice to Defendants contrasts sharply with the great potential for prejudice to the listed subdivision. While subdivision counsel does not concede that any statute of limitations has run for any claims, there is little doubt that Defendants will assert that some of subdivisions’ claims are time-barred in the listed case. This fact is “a factor favoring the plaintiff in a Rule 4(m) analysis.” AIG Managed Mkt. Neutral Fund v. Askin Cap. Mgmt., L.P., 197 F.R.D. 104, 109 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (granting Rule 4(m) time extension in consolidated actions because of judicial efficiency concerns, prejudice to plaintiffs, and no prejudice to defendants). Accordingly, the balance of factors weighs in favor of granting the listed subdivision additional time for service.
Ralls County, Missouri	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023
Ralls County, Missouri	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023
								1/31/2023	· Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Ralls County, MO	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Ralls County, MO	1:20-op-45292	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Ralls County, Missouri	1:20-op-45292-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023

Hickory County, Missouri	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Hickory County, Missouri	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Hickory County, MO	1:20-op-45295	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Hickory County, Missouri	1:20-op-45295-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
New Madrid, Missouri	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
New Madrid County (MO)	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	Yes	7/28/2022	
New Madrid County, Missouri	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
New Madrid County, MO	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
New Madrid County, MO	1:20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
New Madrid County, Missouri	1:20-op-45296-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Adair County, MO	1:20-op-45297	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Adair County, Missouri	1:20-op-45297-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Andrew County, Missouri	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Andrew County, Missouri	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Andrew County, MO	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Andrew County, MO	1:20-op-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Andrew County, Missouri	1:20-op-45298-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Dekalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Dekalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
DeKalb County, MO	1:20-op-45299	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
DeKalb County, Missouri	1:20-op-45299-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
Grundy County, Missouri	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Grundy County, Missouri	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO	1:20-OP-45300 (E.D. Mo)	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Grundy County, MO	1:20-op-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Grundy County, Missouri	1:20-op-45300-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
BOCC of Harmon County, OK	1:20-op-45388	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Harmon County, Oklahoma	1:20-op-45388	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Barry County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:21-op- 45016-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	

St. Clair County, MO v. Allergan PLC et al	1:21-op- 45044-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Appanoose County et al v. Allergan PLC, et al	1:21-op- 45051-DAP	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pharmacy Buying Association	No	Yes	7/17/2021	
Ascension Parish School Board	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Ascension Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Ascension Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Ascension Parish School Board, LA	1:21-op-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/14/2022	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. Bernard Parish, LA School Board	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board, LA	1:21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barry County, MO	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Barry County, MO	1:21-op-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Barry County, Missouri	1:21-op-45016-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Elk City (OK)	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Quest Pharmaceuticals	No	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Elk City, OK	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Elk City, OK	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Keysource Medical	No			
City of Elk City, OK	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Elk City, OK	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
Elk City, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45017	Fulmer Sill	No	2/14/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
District Attorney of Clearfield County	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, &	No	n/a	Ahold Delhaize USA, Inc.	Yes	Yes	9/8/2020	
District Attorney of Clearfield County	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, &	No	n/a	Giant Company, LLC	Yes	Yes	9/8/2020	
District Attorney of Clearfield County v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al	1:21-op-45022	Levy, Baldante, Finney, &	No	n/a	Value Drug	Yes	Yes	9/15/2020	
City of Tulsa, OK	1:21-op-45024	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Middletown Township PA	1:21-op-45030	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	KVK-Tech	No			

Middletown Township v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45030	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Value Drug	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
Middletown Township, Pennsylvania	1:21-op-45030	Marc J. Bern & Partners, LLP	No	3/21/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No		Attempting to locate certified mail receipt for proof of service
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Town of Gramercy, Louisiana	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Town of Gramercy, LA	1:21-op-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
St. James Parish School Board, LA	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. James Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Town of Lutchter, LA	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Town of Lutchter, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutchter, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutchter, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutchter, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Town of Lutchter, Louisiana	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Town of Lutchter, LA	1:21-op-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.

Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Louisiana Wholesale Drug	No			n/a
Lafourche Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/13/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board, Louisiana	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/15/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/16/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board, LA	1:21-op-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. Clair County, Missouri	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023 1/30/2023	· Service Perfected on Mylan Institutional, Inc. on 01/27/2023 · Service Perfected on Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on 01/30/2023 · Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice as to Mylan N.V. Only filed February 24, 2023
St. Clair County, Missouri	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
St. Clair County, MO	1:21-op-45044	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
St. Claire County, Missouri	1:21-op-45044-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Michael Babich	Yes	No		Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice filed February 24, 2023
City of Stillwater, OK	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Stillwater, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
City of Stillwater, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Stilwater, OK	1:21-op-45045	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Altus, OK	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Altus, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Hikma	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	
City of Altus, Oklahoma	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Mylan	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
City of Atlus, OK	1:21-op-45046	Fulmer Sill	Yes		Indivior	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Appanoose County, IA	1:21op45051	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	7/9/2021	
Appanoose County, et al., Iowa	1:21-op-45051	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes for West Ward	7/17/2021 for Westward	We sued West Ward
Appanoose County, IA et al.	1:21-op-45051	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Appanoose County, IA	1:21-OP-45051 (N.D. Io	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hy-Vee	Yes	Yes	7/7/2019	
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Colfax, New Mexico	1:21-op-45055	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Colfax, NM	1:21-op-45055	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Luna, New Mexico	1:21-op-45056	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Luna, NM	1:21-op-45056	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Union, NM	1:21-op-45057	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	2/28/2023	KVK also entered their appearance in this case on 4/29/2021
Board of County Commissioners of The County of Union, New Mexico	1:21-op-45057	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/17/2021	
City of Las Cruces, New Mexico, a municipal corporation	1:21-op-45059	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	03/08/2023	



City of Calera, Alabama	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Calera, Alabama	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Calera, AL	1:21-op-45070	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The City of Gatlinburg, TN	1:21-op-45071	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanas, P.C.	No		Indivior	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
The County Board of Arlington County, Virginia v. Actavis Pharma, Inc., et al.	1:21-op-45078	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	No	Defendant is not included as a defendant in the operative complaint for this listed case. Because the Defendant is not listed in the operative complaint, the Defendant did not need to be served.
Texarkana Independent School District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.

Texarkana Independent School District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
Texarkana Independent School District, et al.	1:21-op-45080	The Coffman Law Firm	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D's knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court's stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
City of Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Winn-Dixie	Yes	Yes	7/21/2021	Different Case Number Format Used by Defendants - Per Pacer there is no document with case no 21-45801. The correct Case number for Niceville is 1:21-op-45081
City of Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	03/10/2023	
City of Niceville, Florida v. Amerisourcebergn Drug Corporation, et al.	1:21-op-45081	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Associated Pharmacies Inc/American Associated Pharmacies	Yes	Yes	02/24/2023	
Niceville, FL	1:21-op-45081	Levin Papantonio Rafferty	Yes		Alvogen	Yes	Yes	3/8/2023	Different Case Number Format Used by Defendants - Per Pacer there is no document with case no 3:21-45801
Pinal County, Arizona	1:21-op-45088	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Pinal County, AZ	1:21-op-45088	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Indivior	No			
Pinal County, AZ	1:21-op-45088-DAP	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
City of Russell, Kentucky et al.	1:21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/2023	Hikma	Yes	Yes	7/6/2021	
City of Russell, Kentucky, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.	1:21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes	7/2/2021	
City of Russell, Kentucky; City of Jenkins, Kentucky; City of Pineville, Kentucky; City of Worthington, Kentucky; City of Vanceburg, Kentucky; City of Greenup, Kentucky; City of South Shore, Kentucky; City of Bellefonte, Kentucky	1:21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/23, 1/31/23, 1/31/23, 1/25/23, 1/25/23, 1/31/23, 1/31/23, 1/26/23	Mylan	Yes	Yes	7/2/2021	
City of Russell, KY et al.	1:21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/2023	KVK-Tech	No			
City of Brewton, Alabama and City of Semmes, Alabama	1:21-op-45113	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Brewton; City of Semmes, Alabama	1:21-op-45113	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Millbrook; City of Wetumpka, Alabama	1:21-op-45135	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Millbrook, Alabama, and City of Wetumpka, Alabama	1:21-op-45135	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Fairhope, Alabama	1:22-op-45002	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on January 11, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of Fairhope, Alabama	1:22-op-45002	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/27/2022	Mylan	No			
Elmore County, Alabama and Randolph County, Alabama	1:22-op-45003	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on January 13, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
Elmore County, Alabama; Randolph County, Alabama	1:22-op-45003	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			

Board of County Commissioners of the County of Torrance, NM	1:22-op-45004	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	No			
City of East Brewton, Alabama	1:22-op-45005	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	Yes	In Process	In Process	Plaintiff's counsel submitted a service waiver to defense counsel on February 1, 2022. Defense counsel did not sign the waiver. Plaintiff's counsel resubmitted the waiver to defense counsel in March, 2023. Defense counsel did not respond. Plaintiff's counsel then requested and has obtained a summons from the Clerk of Court. Service on this defendant is in process.
City of East Brewton, Alabama	1:22-op-45005	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service of Summons sent to counsel on 2/21/2023.
County of Coryell, Texas	1:22-op-45009	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Coryell, TX	1:22-op-45009	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes		Served on 9/16/21
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	Yes	Yes		Served on 9/16/21
County of Kendall, Texas	1:22-op-45010	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Mylan	No			
County of Kendall, TX	1:22-op-45010	Simon Greenstone Panatier, P.C.	No	2/17/2023	Sandoz/Novartis	No			
City of Roanoke, Alabama	1:22-op-45011	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Roanoke, Alabama	1:22-op-45011	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Irondale, AL	1:22-op-45012	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	No			
City of Irondale, Alabama	1:22-op-45012	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Irondale, Alabama	1:22-op-45012	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Alabaster, AL	1:22-op-45013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	No			
City of Alabaster, Alabama	1:22-op-45013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Alabaster, Alabama	1:22-op-45013	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
City of Bessemer, AL	1:22-op-45014	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Indivior	No			
City of Bessemer, Alabama	1:22-op-45014	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No			
City of Bessemer, Alabama	1:22-op-45014	Wallace Jordan Ratliff & Brandt LLC	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No			
Eddy County, NM	1:22-op-45015	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	KVK-Tech	Yes	Yes	Defendant filed its Notice of Appearance prior to service of the complaint	Defendant filed its Notice of Appearance prior to service of the complaint
Eddy County, New Mexico	1:22-op-45015	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Hikma	Yes	Yes	5/23/2022	

City of Clanton, AL, City of Columbiana, AL, City of Helena, AL, City of Pelham, AL	1:22-op-45016	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulan, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Clanton, Alabama; City of Columbiana, Alabama; City of Helena, Alabama; City of Pelham, Alabama	1:22-op-45016	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulan, P.C.	No	3/3/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	<b>PFS Explanation:</b> The PFS for our clients' in Alabama were sent via DropBox. After receiving these pleadings from Defendants, we asked for access to the sharepoint (where the PFS are held) on 3/3/2023. We did not see our clients' PFS's from Alabama in the Sharepoint, so we contacted Sheila Schebek at Spanglaw to discuss. Apparently, there was some sort of glitch or error with the folder being sent, but this issue was unknown to us until 3/3/2023. We resent the PFS on 3/3/2023, but there has been a glitch with uploading them to Sharepoint (due to the native format of some of the documents). We are working through this glitch to get a finalized version (in one pdf) uploaded to the Sharepoint. As Defendants will be able to see, there are no changes to the PFS (other than the names of the folders being changed to include the case number for easier reference for the Defendants) since April 2022 when these were originally sent to Defendants before the failed attempt was made on October 14, 2022 to resend per Judge Polster's Order.
City of Clanton, Alabama	1:22-op-45016	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulan, P.C.	No		Hikma	Yes		
City of Saraland, Alabama	1:22-op-45017	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Mylan	No		
City of Saraland, Alabama	1:22-op-45017	Riley & Jackson, P.C.	No	10/28/2022	Hikma	No		
City of Bay Minette, Alabama, et al.	1:22-op-45018	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC	Yes	Yes	3/23/2023
Bay Minette, AL	1:22-op-45018	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Winn-Dixie	No		
City of Gulf Shores, AL	1:22-op-45019	Jinks, Crow & Dickson, P.C.	No	2/21/2023	Indivior	Yes	In Process	
City of Gulf Shores, Alabama	1:22-op-45019	Jinks, Crow & Dickson, P.C.	No	2/21/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process	
The City Of Gulf Shores, Alabama	1:22-op-45019	Jinks, Crow & Dickson, P.C.	No	2/21/2023	Hikma	Yes	In Process	
City of Childersburg, AL	1:22-op-45020-DAP	Montgomery Ponder, LLC	Yes		Sandoz Inc.	Yes	Yes	
Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools and Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools, Individually, And On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45023	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	
Board of Education of Boardman Local Schools, Ohio; Board of Education of Liberty Local Schools, Ohio	1:22-op-45023	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process	
Southwestern Central School District Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45024	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process	

Southwestern Central School District, New York	1:22-op-45024	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Putnam County School Board, Florida	1:22-op-45025	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Putnam County School Board Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45025	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hamblen County Board of Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hamblen County Board of Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Bd. of Ed, WV	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Keysource Medical	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
Hancock County Board of Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		JM Smith	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Board of Education (TN)	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Quest Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Board of Education and Hamblen County Board of Education Individually, and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Hancock County Board of Education, Tennessee; Hamblen County Board of Education, Tennessee	1:22-op-45027	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Bd. of Ed, WV	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Keysource Medical	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795.
Marion County Board of Education, West Virginia; Wyoming County Board of Education, West Virginia; Kanawha County Board of Education, West Virginia; McDowell County Board of Education, West Virginia	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Mylan	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Board of Education, WV	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Masters Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Marion County Board of Education, Wyoming County Board of Education, Kanawha County Board of Education, McDowell County Board of Education WV, Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
Susanville Elementary School District, California; Lassen County Office of Education, California	1:22-op-45031	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	No	1/2/2023	Mylan	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.

Susanville Elementary School District, Lassen County Office of Education CA, Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated v. Cephalon Inc., et al.	1:22-op-45031	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	No	1/2/2023	KVK-Tech	Yes	In Process		Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
McLennan County	17-op-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Target Corporation	No			
McLennan County, TX	17-OP-45075	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Mora County, NM	17-OP-45080	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Hospira	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Avoyelles Parish Sheriff, LA	17-OP-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Douglas Anderson (Avoyelles Parish Sheriff)	17-OP-45164	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Berkeley County Council, WV	17-op-45171	Skinner Law Firm			Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes			Dismissed on 02/21/2023
Hilton (Rapides Parish Sheriff), LA	17-OP-45178	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Mancuso (Calcasieu Parish Sheriff), LA	17-OP-45179	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Garber (Lafayette Parish Sheriff), LA	17-OP-45180	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Humphreys County, MS	18-OP-45021	Diaz Law Firm, PLLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Lansing, MI	18-OP-45054	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Grand Traverse County, MI	18-OP-45056	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Nolan County, TX	18-op-45061	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Abbott	No			On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16, 2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any complaints as to service of process are moot.
Mitchell County, TX	18-op-45063	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Abbott	No			On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16, 2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any complaints as to service of process are moot.
County of Wichita, TX	18-OP-45064	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Chippewa County, MI	18-OP-45066	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Delta County, MI	18-OP-45067	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
City of Escanaba, MI	18-OP-45068	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Polk County, TX	18-OP-45077	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Saginaw County, MI	18-OP-45082	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Genesee County, MI	18-OP-45083	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
City of Detroit, MI	18-OP-45084	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Macomb County, MI	18-OP-45085	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Seal (Washington Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45093	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Woods (Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45099	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Roscommon County, MI	18-OP-45102	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Marquette County, MI	18-OP-45104	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Crawford County, MI	18-OP-45105	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Leelanau County, MI	18-OP-45111	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.



Mason County, MI	18-OP-45112	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Manistee County, MI	18-OP-45113	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	2/7/2018	Service was timely. The docket shows a proof of service filed, including an affidavit of service perfected on 2/7/18.
Craft (Vernon Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45140	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Throckmorton County, TX	18-op-45141	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Abbott	No			On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16, 2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any complaints as to service of process are moot.
Hebert (Allen Parish Sheriff)	18-OP-45142	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Richardson (Sabine Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45143	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Russell (Ouachita Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45154	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Municipality of Guayanilla, PR	18-OP-45176	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
Soileau (Evangeline Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45189	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Summers County Commission, MD	18-OP-45226	Wooton, Davis, Hussell &	No	N/A	Richie Pharmacal	Yes	No	N/A	Summers County has participated in a global settlement with regard to the State of West Virginia and pursuant to MOA
Childress County, TX	18-OP-45229	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No	2/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Kinney County, TX	18-op-45241	Harrison Davis Morrison Jones	No		Abbott	Yes			On June 12, 2018, a Notice of Non-suit was filed as to Abbott Laboratories, only. On March 16, 2023, this client refiled a Notice of Non-suit as to Abbott Laboratories, only. As such, any complaints as to service of process are moot.
Williams (East Carroll Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45259	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Phillely (West Carroll Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45260	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Tarrant	18-OP-45274	Lanier Law Firm	No	10/28/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Philadelphia, MS	18-OP-45279	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Gratiot County, MI	18-OP-45339	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Alcona County, MI	18-OP-45340	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Arenac County, MI	18-OP-45341	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Dickinson County, MI	18-OP-45342	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.

Iosco County, MI	18-OP-45343	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
City of Iron Mountain, MI	18-OP-45344	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Ostego County, MI	18-OP-45345	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Montmorency County, MI	18-OP-45347	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Ogemaw County, MI	18-OP-45348	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Isabella County, MI	18-OP-45349	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Shiawassee County, MI	18-OP-45350	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Lenawee County, MI	18-OP-45351	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Sanilac County, MI	18-OP-45352	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.

Antrim County, MI	18-OP-45354	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Hillsdale County, MI	18-OP-45355	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Benzie County, MI	18-OP-45356	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Oceana County, MI	18-OP-45357	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Osceola County, MI	18-OP-45359	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Alger County, MI	18-OP-45360	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Baraga County, MI	18-OP-45361	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Luce County, MI	18-OP-45362	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Wexford County, MI	18-OP-45364	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.

Lake County, MI	18-OP-45366	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Pike County, KY	18-OP-45368	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Floyd County, KY	18-OP-45369	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Knott County, KY	18-OP-45370	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Multnomah County	18-op-45377	Wiggins Childs Pantazis Fi	No	3/27/2023	Target Corporation	No			
Family Practice Clinic of Booneville, KY	18-op-45390	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
City of Grand Rapids, MI	18-OP-45406	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	8/30/2018	A waiver of service was obtained from Costco on 8/30/2018, alongside waivers for 32 other subdivisions. Service was perfected by waiver just over one month after the deadline established by CMO One. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by this delay, especially considering that Costco was stayed as a non-litigating defendant for more than four years after its initial waiver. As such, there is good cause to allow this subdivision's case against Costco to proceed.
Clackamas County, OR	18-OP-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Costco	Yes	Yes	7/12/2019	Waiver of Service filed with the court on 7/12/2019. Doc No. 28.
County of Clackamas, OR, et al (Yamhill Cty)	18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	2/7/2023 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place in repository in 11/22	SuperValu	No			
Yamhill County	18-op-45442	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	2/7/2023 -sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22 but resent on 2/7/23 after not being place in repository in 11/22	Target Corporation	No			
Morgan Cty, WV	18-op-45444	Skinner Law Firm			Auburn Pharmaceutical	No			Dismissed 02/21/2023
Butts County (GA)	18-op-45490	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/13/2022	JM Smith	Yes	Yes	4/25/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 4/25/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/13/20.
St. Tammany Parish Coroner's Office, LA	18-OP-45492	Lillis Law Firm & Tonry, Brinson, & Glorioso	No	3/20/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Clarksville, TN	18-OP-45517	Friedman, Dazzio & Zulanis, P.C.	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	In Process		
County of Ballard, KY	18-op-45593	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
Bergen County, NJ	18-op-45616	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Bergen County, NJ	18-OP-45616	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Troup County, GA	18-OP-45715	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
St. Bernard Parish Government, LA	18-OP-45756	Law Office of David W. Gernhauser, Jr., LLC	Yes	3/27/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Bon Secours Health System, KY	18-op-45819	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant enterd appearances on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
Bon Secours Health System, Inc., VA, et al	18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	SuperValu	No			

Bon Secours Health System, Inc.; Bon Secours-Richmond Community Hospital, Incorporated; Bon Secours DePaul Medical Center, Inc.; Bon Secours-Memorial Regional Medical Center, Inc.; Bon Secours-St. Francis Medical Center, Inc.; Bon Secours-St. Mary's Hospital of Richmand, Inc.; Bon Secourse-Virginia Healthsource, Inc.; Chesapeake Hospital Corporation; Mary Immaculate Hospital, Incorporated, Maryview Hospital	18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Apotex	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	
Bon Secours Health System, VA	18-op-45820	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant enterd appearances on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
Wiley (Ascension Parish Sheriff)	18-OP-45842	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Tubbs (Morehouse Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-45884	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Ontongon County, MI	18-OP-45893	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
Presque Isle County, MI	18-OP-45894	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
St. Clair County, MI	18-OP-45896	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/30/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/28/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
Traverse City, MI	18-OP-45901	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
City of East Lansing, MI	18-OP-45902	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
City of Westland, MI	18-OP-45903	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
City of Jackson, MI	18-OP-45904	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	9/4/2018	Service was timely. The complaint was filed on 7/31/18, so the deadline established by CMO One is inapplicable, and the deadline for service under the FRCP 4(m) would be 10/29/18. The docket shows a waiver filed dated 9/4/18.
Hudson County, NJ	18-op-45937	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Abbott	No	In Process		
Jersey City, NJ	18-op-45948	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Jersey City, NJ	18-OP-45948	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Huntington, WV	18-op-45984	Motley Rice	Yes	3/27/2023	Target Corporation	Yes	In Process		Curative service and waiver sent to Defense counsel Amy Fiterman on behalf of Target Stores, Inc. as per the template filed 6/17/2019 (ECF 1687-1) and amended per counsel's currrent contact information as filed on Target's Amended Status Report (ECF No. 4942).
Essex County, NJ	18-op-45989	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.



Essex County, NJ	18-OP-45989	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Laredo, TX	18-OP-46026	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/28/2022	Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	2/9/2023	
Guidroz (St. Landry Parish Sheriff), LA	18-OP-46051	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
Adams Cty, ID	18-op-46062	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	6/5/2019	
Opelousas General Hospital Authority, LA	18-OP-46083	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Morris & Dickson	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hospitals, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Wolfe Co., KY	18-OP-46099	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Monmouth County, NJ	18-op-46118	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Abbott	No			
LaSalle Parish Hospital, Hardtner Medical Center, LA	18-OP-46150	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Morris & Dickson	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hospitals, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
Carroll County, GA	18-op-46269	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Assertio	Yes	Yes	2/17/2023	Assertio Therapeutics, Inc. and Assertio Holdings, Inc. Assertio is f/k/a Depomed, Inc. and Depomed Waiver was perfected 5/15/2018
Canyon County, ID	18-op-46277	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	5/31/2019	
City of Bogalusa, LA	18-OP-46297	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Eunice, LA	18-OP-46328	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
Mental Health & Recovery Services Board of Allen, Auglaize and Hardin Counties (OH)	18-op-46344	Spangenberg Shibley & Liber	No		Prescription Supply	Yes			dismissed 3/27/23
Gilley (Richland Parish Sheriff), LA	19-OP-45007	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Donaldsonville, LA	19-OP-45028	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
Kentucky River District Health Department	19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	UCB	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 1/10/2022
Kentucky River Dist. Health Dept, KY	19-op-45050	The Finnell Firm	No	N/A	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Defendant entered an appearance on 10/7/2020 and 12/12/2022
Harrison County, MS	19-OP-45113	Frazer PLC	No	1/10/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Pulaski County, GA	19-op-45176	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Apotex	Yes	Yes	9/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
Stephens County, GA	19-op-45195	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Apotex	Yes	Yes	9/4/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 9/4/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
City of Memphis, TN	19-OP-45220	O'Leary, Shelton, Corrigan, Peterson, Dalton & Quillin, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/16/2023	Waiver Signed by Defendant on 2/16/23
McCain (Grant Parish Sheriff), LA	19-OP-45244	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			PFS was re-served pursuant to Court's 10/6/22 Order via email to the PEC/PSC on 10/10/2022. Based on review of the PFS Repository (export data), the PFS was available/uploaded to the PFS repository on or around 10/10/2022 at 11:28am.
Buchanan County, VA	19-op-45253	Street Law Firm	Yes		Abbott	Yes			The case was removed pre-service. Once the case was removed to federal court, it was stayed pending transfer to the MDL. Since that time, we have had no communications regarding service of process on Abbott.
Ionia County, MI	19-OP-45261	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	7/11/2019	Service was perfected by waiver only three days late, under the standard 90 days afforded by the FRCP. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by the three day delay.
Livingston County, MI	19-OP-45262	Weitz & Luxenberg	No	12/1/2022	Costco	Yes	Yes	7/11/2019	Service was perfected by waiver only three days late, under the standard 90 days afforded by the FRCP. Costco was well on notice of the claims against it, given the myriad other plaintiffs bringing the same claims, and Costco was not prejudiced by the three day delay.
Fayette County, GA	19-OP-45293	Blasingame, Burch, Garrard & Ashley, P.C.	No	12/14/2022	Alvogen	Yes	Yes	8/2/2019	Defendant signed and returned the waiver on 8/2/19. Plaintiff filed the waiver with the Court on 2/6/23.
City of Prestonburg, KY	19-OP-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		



City of Prestonsburg	19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		UCB	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-OP-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Alvogen	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-op-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		
City of Prestonsburg, KY	19-OP-45294	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
Butler County, MO; Cape Girardeau County, MO; Christian County, MO; City of Independence, MO; City of Joplin, MO; Crawford County, MO; Dent County, MO; Dunklin County, MO; Greene County, MO; Iron County, MO; Jasper County, MO; Madison County, MO; Perry County, MO; Ste. Genevieve County, MO; Stone County, MO; Taney County, MO; Texas County, MO; Washington County, MO	19-op-45371	Stranch, Jennings & Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023	Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
Union County, NJ	19-op-45374	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Abbott	No			
Jefferson County, NY	19-op-45437	Sanford Heisler Sharp, LLP	Yes		Abbott	Yes	Yes	2/24/2023	Within 90 days of filing the complaint, subdivision counsel requested a waiver of service from the Defendant but did not receive a response. After conferring with Defendant's counsel, Defendant has recently agreed to waive service, and subdivision counsel has filed an executed waiver.
City of Inez	19-op-454499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Zydus	Yes	In Process		
Chatham County, NC; City of Canton, NC	19-OP-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	10/1/2019	
City of Canton, NC	19-OP-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
City of Canton, NC	19-op-45462	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	10/10/2019	
City of Inez, KY	19-op-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Apotex	Yes	In Process		
City of Inez, KY	19-OP-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
City of Inez, KY	19-OP-45499	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	In Process		
Cty. of Curry, OR	19-op-45512	D'Amore Law Group, P.C.	No	11/29/2022 - sent to PFS counsel on 11/21/22	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	In Process		Documents are out for service with the Clerk of the Court. Waiver of service was sent on 9/18/2019 to counsel of record, Nicholas Upfal, but no response was ever received. Service by Clerk. Summons and Complaint addressed to Auburn Pharmaceutical Company placed in U.S. Mail. Type of service: Certified Mail. Receipt # 9314 7699 0430 0104 6169 37. (F,ML) (Entered: 03/03/2023) - Docket No. 43
City of Long Beach, MS	19-OP-45517	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	10/29/2019 & 12/11/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Paintsville, KY	19-OP-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville	19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Zydus	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville, KY	19-OP-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Alvogen	Yes	In Process		
City of Paintsville, KY	19-op-45559	Bryant Law Center	Yes		Apotex	Yes	In Process		
Sussex County, NJ	19-op-45616	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Sussex County, NJ	19-OP-45616	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Williamson County, IL	19-op-45657	Prince Law Firm	No	N/a	Abbott	No			Plaintiff's Fact Sheet is being completed.
City of Claremont, NH	19-op-45690	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Eric Knight MD	Yes	No		response to be provided
Sullivan County, NH	19-op-45704	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/1/2023	Eric Knight MD	Yes	No		getting dismissed
Passaic County, NJ	19-op-45741	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Abbott	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
Passaic County, NJ	19-OP-45741	Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C.	No	11/18/2022	Costco	Yes	In Process		Provided to Process Servers on 2/24/2023.
City of Hoover, AL	19-op-45746	Wallace Jordan	No	10/28/2022	Target Corporation	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service sent on November 26, 2019 when filing its short-form amended complaint by regular mail to counsel of record.

Mandeville City, LA	19-op-45753	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Town of Pearl River, La	19-op-45754	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Bingham County, Idaho	19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Pfizer	Yes			SHC not pursuing
Bingham County, ID	19-op-45758	Simmons Hanly Conroy, LLC	No	11/18/2022	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	11/7/2019	
City of Slidell, LA	19-op-45769	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Washington Parish Government, LA	19-OP-45773	Leger & Shaw	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/14/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/14/2023.
Board of Commissioners of Barber County, KS	19-OP-45785	Hutton & Hutton	Yes	N/A	Alvogen	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	Waiver of service was originally sent to Alvogen. Alvogen signed and returned the waiver of service. The executed waiver of service was filed on the docket on 2/15/23.
City of Jackson, MS	19-OP-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
City of Jackson, MS	19-op-45806	Bossier & Associates, PLLC	No	2/14/2023	Pfizer	Yes	No		Defendant's counsel was sent Waiver of Service forms, which were not timely returned. We have re-initiated efforts to obtain waiver, however, none have been received to date. NOTE: SOL does not run against this municipal Plaintiff, and thus, the case can be refiled if required.
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe	19-op-45841				Sun Pharmaceutical	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, OH	19-op-45841	Robins Kaplan LLP	No	Tribes not required to file PFS.	Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	No		The Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan is an Indian Tribe. Guidance from the MDL Tribal Leadership Committee is that Tribes are not subject to the current Order on PFS/Service issues. In any event, attempts to secure a Waiver of Service on Auburn in compliance with CMO were undertaken when Complaint was filed and continue today. Auburn has been uncooperative.
City of Auburn	19-OP-45843	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
St. Francois County, MO	19-op-45847	Stranch, Jennings & Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023	Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
City of Ogdensburg, NY	19-OP-45852	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Rochester, NY	19-OP-45853	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Saratoga Springs, NY	19-OP-45857	Napoli Shkolnik	No	1/3/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Kauai, HI	19-OP-45862	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
Mayflower Municipal Health Group	19-op-45897	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Apotex	Yes	Yes	11/25/2019	PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is not required for this Plaintiff
Burlington County, NJ	19-op-45928	Pogust Millrood, Stampone O'Brien Dilsheimer, Smithbridge	No	Pending	Abbott	No			
City of Pascagoula, MS	19-OP-45934	Reeves & Mestayer, PLLC	Yes	1/17/2020 & 12/11/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
Lincoln County, WA	19-OP-45962	Keller Rohrback L.L.P.	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	2/21/2023	Waiver filed 2/21/23. Only plaintiff client of KR to sue Sun Pharmaceuticals. Service oversight. Waiver request sent 2/15/2023. Waiver returned 2/21/23.
Westmoreland Co., VA	19-OP-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Richie Pharmacal	No			
Westmoreland County, VA	19-op-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Auburn Pharmaceutical	Yes	Yes	4/12/2021	
Westmoreland County, VA	19-OP-45993	The Finnell Firm	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	4/6/2021	
Delaware Nation, OK	19-op-46011				GCP Pharma	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).

Cumberland County, NJ	19-op-46016	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Abbott	No			
Atlantic County, NJ	19-OP-46071	Weisbrod Matteis & Copley PLLC, Cooper Levenson	Yes		Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	6/16/2021	Defendant Waiver of Service, Submitted Complaint as PFS prior to 10/14/2022
Sheet Metal Workers Local 38 Insurance and Welfare Fund	19-op-46094	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Apotex	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is not required for this Plaintiff; defendant counsel submitted waiver via email 12/6/19
Pipefitters Local 636 Insurance Fund	19-op-46095	Napoli Shkolnik	No	NA	Apotex	Yes	Yes	12/6/2019	PFS is not applicable, as per Judge Polster Order (docket #368) dated 6/19/18 Plaintiff Fact Sheet is not required for this Plaintiff; defendant counsel submitted waiver via email 12/6/19
City of Buffalo, NY	19-OP-46104	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/13/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
County of Allegheny, NY	19-OP-46151	Napoli Shkolnik	No	2/2/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Ocean County, NJ	19-op-46157	Sanders Phillips Grossman, LLC AKA Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, LLC	Yes		Abbott	No	In Process		
City of Amsterdam, NY	19-OP-46162	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Poughkeepsie, NY	19-OP-46163	Napoli Shkolnik	No	12/22/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
E. Baton Rouge Parish Clerk of Court, LA	19-OP-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA	19-op-46164	Kanner & Whiteley, LLC	No	2/14/2023	Abbott	No			
Town of Gramercy, LA	20-OP-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Henderson, KY	20-op-45062	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	1/10/2023	Assertio	No			
Hardin County Fiscal Court, KY; Breckenridge County Fiscal Court, KY; Green County Fiscal Court, KY; Meade County Fiscal Court, KY; Ohio County Fiscal Court, KY	20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes	1/10/23, 1/10/23, 1/10/23, 1/31/23	Assertio	No			
Hardin County, KY, et al.	20-op-45063	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	Yes		Abbott	No			
Camden County, MO	20-op-45068	Stranch, Jennings & Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023	Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
Lincoln County, MO	20-op-45069	Stranch, Jennings & Garvey PLLC	No	2/21/2023	Assertio	Yes	No		This Defendant has been dismissed.
Bunkie General Hospital (Avoyelles Parish), LA	20-OP-45098	Neblett, Beard & Arsenault	No		Morris & Dickson	No			The MDL Court's June 19, 2018 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (R. Doc. 638) expressly states that "Only Plaintiffs that are Governmental Entities (e.g., Cities, Towns, Counties) shall complete a PFS. Other entities (e.g., Hospitals, Third-Party-Payers) do not need to complete a PFS. "
BOCC of Lincoln County, OK	20-op-45128	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Vernon County, MO	20-OP-45133	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
LSU Board of Supervisors, LA	20-OP-45157	Irpino Avin Hawkins	No		Morris & Dickson	No			This client is not a political subdivision and therefore not subject to submission of a PFS. Counsel for Plaintiff reached out to counsel representing Morris and Dickson and shared that correspondence with Liaison Counsel once learning that Morris and Dickson erroneously listed this plaintiff on their Exh. A, which responded to Order at Dkt. 4801. This plaintiff should not be included on Exh. A and is not subject to compliance/issues raised in the Order at Dkt. 4801.
City of Morganfield, KY	20-op-45167	Frazer PLC	No	2/6/2023	Assertio	Yes	In Process		Waiver of Service Requested; no response.
Stone County, MS	20-op-45168	Frazer PLC			Assertio	Yes			Voluntarily Dismissed as Duplicative Action
Barton County, MO	20-OP-45171	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
Assumption Parish Policy Jury	20-OP-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish Police Jury, LA	20-OP-45205	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			

Leland Falcon, Sheriff of Assumption Parish	20-OP-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Assumption Parish Sheriff, LA	20-OP-45206	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
West Ascension Parish Hospital Service District, LA	20-OP-45207	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Lafourche Parish Government	20-OP-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish Government, LA	20-OP-45212	Leger & Shaw	No	3/21/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
McDonald County, Missouri	20-op-45225	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		UCB	Yes	Yes	2/15/2023	
City of Daphne, AL	20-OP-45227	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
Catawba Nation, SC	20-op-45234				GCP Pharma	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
White Mountain Apache Nation, AZ	20-op-45243				GCP Pharma	Yes			The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court's 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to "plaintiff-subdivisions" only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Hughes County Board of Commissioners, OK	20-OP-45258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		Morris & Dickson	No			
City of Fultondale, et al., AL	20-OP-45265	Mantiply & Assoc.	No	10/28/2022	Morris & Dickson	No			
New Madrid County, MO	20-op-45296	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Apotex	Yes	Yes	2/14/2023	
Andrew County, MO	20-OP-45298	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Grundy County, MO*	20-OP-45300	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
BOCC of Hughes County, OK	20-op-46258	Napoli Shkolnik	Yes		GCP Pharma	Yes	Yes	3/16/2023	
Ascension Parish School Board, LA	21-OP-45006	Leger & Shaw	No	3/1/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
St. Bernard Parish School Board	21-op-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	TopRx	Yes	Yes	3/20/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/20/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/20/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board	21-OP-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. Bernard Parish School Board, LA	21-OP-45014	Leger & Shaw	No	2/23/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Barry County, MO	21-OP-45016	Theodora Oringher PC	Yes		Morris & Dickson	Yes	Yes	1/27/2023	
Town of Gramercy, LA	21-OP-45031	Leger & Shaw	No	3/16/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board	21-OP-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
St. James Parish School Board, LA	21-OP-45034	Leger & Shaw	No	3/17/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Town of Lutchet, LA	21-OP-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Town of Lutchet, LA	21-OP-45035	Leger & Shaw	No	3/15/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Lafourche Parish School Board	21-OP-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Sun Pharmaceuticals	Yes	Yes	3/15/2023	Personal Service of short form amended complaint with state court petition on registered agent for service of process made 3/14/2023. Executed Return of Service filed 3/15/2023.
Lafourche Parish School Board, LA	21-OP-45036	Leger & Shaw	No	3/20/2023	Morris & Dickson	No			
Tarrant County Hospital District	21-op-45077	Wick Phillips Gould & Martin	No	By 3/29/2023	Target Corporation	Yes	No	By 3/29/2023	We were waiting for the moratorium to be lifted, and are actively considering any settlements that are presented, but, if necessary, will immediately begin service
Tarrant Cty., TX Hosp. Dist.	21-OP-45077	Wick Phillips Gould & Martin	No	By 3/29/2023	Costco	Yes	No	By 3/29/2023	We were waiting for the moratorium to be lifted, and are actively considering any settlements that are presented, but, if necessary, will immediately begin service

City of Russell, KY; City of Jenkins, KY; City of Pineville, KY; City of Worthington, KY; City of Vanceburg, KY; City of Greenup, KY; City of South Shore, KY; City of Bellefonte, KY	21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/23, 1/31/23, 1/31/23, 1/25/23, 1/25/23, 1/31/23, 1/31/23, 1/26/23	Assertio	No		
Russell City, KY, et al.	21-op-45094	Bahe Cook Cantley & Nefzger PLC / Grabhorn Law	No	2/1/2023	Abbott	No		
Marion County Board of Education, WV; Wyoming County Board of Education, WV; Kanawha County Board of Education, WV; McDowell County Board of Education, WV	22-op-45028	Mehri & Skalet PLLC	Yes		Assertio	Yes	In Process	Inadvertent oversight, without prejudice or harm given D’s knowledge of the filing, receipt of the fact sheet, and the Court’s stay on litigation activity. ECF Nos. 23, 3795. Requests for waivers were served on Feb. 23, 2023.
City of Jacksonville, FL	3:18-cv-00751-TJC-PDB	Scott+Scott Attorneys at Law LLP	Yes		Michael Babich	No		A copy of PFS, which was submitted to resubmitted portal on 10/7/22, was sent and received by Babich's counsel on 2/22/23
Muscogee (Creek) Nation, OK v. Purdue Pharma L.P. et al.	N.D. Ohio, 1:18-op-45459-DAP	Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse, Miller & Monkman, LLP; Gilbert LLP; Fields, Han & Cuniff LLC; Boies Schiller Flexner LLP; Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL		N/A: Pursuant to ECF No. 642, Tribes were not required to submit Plaintiff Fact Sheets	Pharmacy Buying Association	No	2020	ECF No. 4878 acknowledges service as of 2020
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska v. Cephalon, Inc. et al.	N.D. Ohio, 1:20-op-45099-DAP				Pharmacy Buying Association	No		The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska v. Cephalon, Inc., et al	N.D. Ohio, 1:20-op-45161-DAP				Pharmacy Buying Association	Yes		The PEC notes the plaintiff is a tribe and was improperly identified by Defendant on its service and fact sheet list. The Court’s 1/3/23 Order (#4801) was directed to “plaintiff-subdivisions” only. In addition, the 6/19/18 Fact Sheet Implementation Order (#638) was applicable to Government Entities only and did not apply to plaintiff-tribes (see 6/20/18 Order, #642).